

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^O XXIII. APRIL 1881.

ART. I.—ON CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE.

1. *On Christian Marriage.* Encyclical Letter of our Holy Father, by Divine Providence Pope Leo XIII., to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Catholic World, in favour and communion with the Apostolic See. Authorized Translation. (London, 1880.)
2. *On Christian Marriage.* Address at his Diocesan Synod, by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Fredericton, Metropolitan of Canada.
3. *Divorces in New England.* By NATHAN ALLEN, M.D., LL.D. (*North American Review* : June, 1880.)

ON February 10, 1880, Pope Leo XIII. issued an Encyclical on Christian Marriage. What may have been the immediate cause of this proceeding it is not very material to inquire. No one in any degree acquainted with the subject will be likely to question the existence of causes, abundant and grave enough. Whoever will take the trouble to compare the teaching of the Christian Scriptures and the Christian Church on the doctrine and discipline of marriage with the formal laws, and still more with the views boldly held and the designs boldly advocated, in most of the civilized and nominally Christian States of Europe and America, will find the contrast sufficiently startling. And this is all the more alarming, when we reflect that the subject of this contrast is not a matter of even secondary importance, but one which by general consent lies at the root of all social and political order. On this point there is at least a theoretical agreement between Pope Leo and the most revolutionary teachers.

The Encyclical, taken as a whole, and in reference to its main subject, is weighty and wise. It is perhaps inevitable,

VOL. XII.—NO. XXIII.

B

370615

but not on that account the less to be regretted, that both its wisdom and its weight should suffer from the drawbacks which seem inseparable from all Papal pronouncements, chiefly, of course, from its marked Ultramontanist, but also from its stilted and somewhat sententious style. These defects, however, cannot destroy, though they certainly mar and will probably impede, its general excellence and utility.

Straight to the mark flies the Pontifical shaft when the Pope specifies 'unity and perpetuity' as 'two most excellent properties, deeply impressed and engraven upon' marriage at the beginning, 'that it might answer more fittingly to the all-wise counsels of God' (p. 5). Of these, 'unity' is like the sanctuary enshrining its inner holiness; 'perpetuity,' the rampart warding off attacks from without. It is probable that every assault on marriage violates one or other or both of these cardinal properties.

Another very weighty truth is put forward further on:—

'The chief reason why they [who wish utterly to overthrow the nature of marriage] act in this way is because the minds of many, following the opinions of a false philosophy and a corrupt custom, think nothing so unbearable as submission and obedience; and strive with great pertinacity that not only individual men, but also families, and indeed the whole human society, may in their pride despise the sovereignty of God'—(pp. 12, 13).¹

This is a consideration of the first moment. God has made the law of obedience a fundamental principle of marriage: as it is written, 'Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church' (Ephes. v. 22, 23). We may even, though in a more general way, extend the principle on the same Divine authority to the original and fundamental relation of woman to man. For 'the head of every man is Christ; and the head of woman' [not 'the woman,' as A.V.] 'the man; and the Head of Christ, God.' (1 Cor. xi. 3.)

The Encyclical is chiefly directed against the evils of divorce, and to this we will in the first place turn our attention.

That the state of life-long monogamy is the exclusive idea of marriage sanctioned by Christianity is indisputable. It is also allowed by thoughtful men, on other than Christian or even utilitarian grounds, to be on the whole the best and

¹ It may be thought, perhaps, from the immediately succeeding words, that this refers to the refusal to allow marriage 'to be subject to the jurisdiction of the Church.' But if it be so, the passage is none the less susceptible of a wider and yet more important application.

most ennobling for mankind at large. So Lecky acknowledges :—

‘It may be intelligibly said, without any reference to utilitarian considerations, that monogamy is a higher state than polygamy. The utilitarian arguments in its defence are also extremely powerful.’¹

Among these arguments he includes one, which indeed is almost self-evident, except under conditions of equal and common degradation : ‘In no other does woman assume the position of the equal of man.’ And again :—

‘We have ample grounds for maintaining that the life-long union of one man and of one woman should be the normal or dominant type of intercourse between the sexes. We can prove that it is on the whole most conducive to the happiness, and also to the moral elevation, of all parties.’²

Nevertheless, owing to a greater or less facility of divorce, this law is the law of but a small minority of the most civilized and Christian nations of the world. Provision for a monogamy which is not necessarily permanent is made by law in Great Britain (including Ireland), in Belgium, Austria (for non-Catholics), in Switzerland, Rhenish Prussia, Baden, Germany, Russia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland; and the United States of America. All these countries, under a great variety of conditions, allow of divorce with liberty of re-marriage. In the following countries it is not allowed : France, Italy, Hungary, Spain, Portugal, and Austria (when both husband and wife are Catholics).³ Of the latter class, and specially of France as its most important representative, we shall say something further on ; at present our business lies with countries where divorce is legally permitted. And to avoid ambiguity, we may say at once that in speaking of the laws of nations we shall use the word ‘divorce’ in the strict sense of divorce *à vinculo matrimonii*.

That the Divine Law, as revealed by our Incarnate Lord, allows of divorce, or ‘putting away,’ for one cause, and for

¹ *European Morals*, vol. ii. p. 278.

² *Ibid.* p. 348.

³ The information about the law of divorce in foreign countries has been mainly derived from a work published last year in London, anonymously, but apparently by a lawyer, and, as claimed on the title-page, a Doctor of Laws. In regard to religion and morality, the level of the work may be estimated at zero ; but we know no reason for doubting its trustworthiness on such matters as this. The author, who writes under the pseudonym ‘*Philanthropus*’ (under which title we shall refer to his work when necessary), has drawn his information as to European countries chiefly from Naquet’s book *Le Divorce* (which we also have used, but not with sufficient leisure for collation), and as to America, from Ripley and Dana’s *American Cyclopædia* (New York, 1874).

one cause only, is almost universally conceded, and is indeed incontestable; unless we will hold with Milton that the Lord deliberately exceeded the truth on one side as a set-off to the counter excess of the Jews on the other, leaving it to His hearers to strike out for themselves the true *via media* between the false extremes; or, as the great poet euphuistically puts it, 'like a wise physician administering one excess against another to reduce us to a permiss.'¹ In the one case, nevertheless, in which 'putting away' is permitted, re-marriage during the life-time of the rejected partner is not included in the permission, according to the nearly uniform interpretation of the Church. Were confirmation of that interpretation needed, we think it would be sufficiently found in the analogy of the Law of the Incarnation, especially in its sacramental extension to all the members of the mystical Body of Christ, to which the law of marriage so remarkably corresponds.²

Taking then as the standard the Divine Law as above understood, we find that the law of England, though departing from it less widely than that of any other State where divorce *à vinculo* is permitted at all, still does depart from it, and that by both excess and defect. The defect is in principle, as not placing the two partners on an equality, but refusing divorce to the wife for reasons held sufficient for granting it to the husband. This is of itself an injury to the unity of marriage, as though the bonds which unite the husband to the wife were more strong and more difficult to break than those which unite her to him; or as if his sin were less than hers. The fault in excess lies of course in the simple fact that divorce is permitted at all, which violates the primary principle and 'most excellent property of perpetuity.'

According to the existing law in England, which dates from 1857, divorce is granted to the husband for the wife's unfaithfulness; and to the wife for that of the husband, but only on the condition of its being aggravated by circumstances of odious enormity or of extreme cruelty, or of inexcusable desertion for at least two years. And in every such case, divorce is made legally equivalent to death in regard to liberty of 're-marriage.'

No other civilized State, we think (excepting perhaps the State of New York mentioned further on), which allows of

¹ *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, 1645, pp. 32, 33.

² 'S. Paul,' says Döllinger, 'treated the marriage bond as a type of the indissoluble union of Christ and the Church, and therefore as itself indissoluble' (*First Age of the Church*, p. 427. English Translation).

divorce *à vinculo* on any grounds, has departed so little from the Christian rule ; but still, setting aside the disastrous effect of the law in its actual operation, the great objection to it is that it surrenders the principle and so removes the main barrier against further gradual degradation. And as to the permission to the partners in guilt to 're-marry,' while nothing better than reckless special pleading without a vestige of scriptural authority can be alleged in its favour, even the 're-marriage' of the innocent is a liberty which, it was observed by the *Guardian* in 1857, 'no civilized nation has yet attempted to give without suffering deeply and permanently in its highest social interests.'¹

It is true, no doubt, as the supporters of the Divorce Act in 1857 took care to remind us, that the principle of indissolubility of marriage had been surrendered long before by the system of private Acts professing to dissolve marriages with liberty of 're-marriage.' Sir George Grey, among others, pressed this argument, and said that no one could consistently vote against the new Bill, on the ground of the indissolubility of marriage, who was not prepared to vote against every such private Bill, of which no fewer than four were at that very time before Parliament. Still, though the logic of the argument is unassailable, the conversion of an exceptional permission, occasionally called into being from time to time as a supersession of general imperial law, into a portion of that imperial law itself was a momentous change, testifying first to the dangerous force of the plea from consistency, which tells so strongly on the English mind, and next to that very process and those very effects of the relaxation of morals which we have just mentioned.

The mischief, once introduced, grew, though slowly. How it grew and how slowly, the following summary statement will show :—

'In the interval of more than 120 years which elapsed between the Reformation and the date of the Bill to enable Lord Roos to marry again, the Act in favour of the Marquis of Northampton stood alone, and that Bill was repealed, and no subsequent measures were taken for amending the repeal or re-establishing the principle of the divorce. The Bill in favour of Lord Roos was carried, in an age of libertinism, by a political intrigue, by a majority of two, after a strenuous opposition.'² In the 130 years which followed this assumed

¹ *Guardian*, July 29, 1857.

² This Bill was introduced in hope of its facilitating a project for getting a divorce for the King, Charles II., and was 'countenanced and driven on,' says Evelyn, by the King himself, so much so that, to quote Mr. Gladstone's speech in 1857 (*Guardian Report*), 'the House of Lords

method of divorce there were 132 Bills of divorce granted by Parliament, namely, 8 in the first forty-five years, 50 in the succeeding sixty years, and 74 in the last twenty-five years, terminating in the year 1799. In the four years immediately preceding the session of 1800, there had been 29 divorce Bills, besides 5 which had been rejected; in the session of 1799, 10 were passed and 2 rejected. . . . This statement of the progress of these Bills and of the accelerated ratio of their increase,' adds the writer whom we are quoting, 'may show . . . the pernicious facility with which these Parliamentary divorces were sought and obtained, when these prejudices [against the total dissolution of marriage] were relaxed and overcome.'¹

To bring the summary down to the passing of the present Act, we may add, on the authority of Mr. Gladstone, as reported in the *Guardian* (*ut sup.* p. 628), that from 1799 to 1830 there were eighty-two of these private Bills, and from 1830 to 1856, ninety-nine.

On the passing of the Act a great development of evil was at once apparent; as indeed was to be expected. In fact the Act was passed, it may be said, on purpose to allow such development, to facilitate, and so practically to encourage it. From 1858, when the law came into operation, to 1877 inclusive, the yearly number of decrees for divorce *made absolute*, as taken from the official 'Judicial Statistics,' are as follows:—

1858, 24	1863, 134	1868, 23 ²	1873, 215
1859, 117	1864, 168	1869, 159	1874, 194
1860, 103	1865, 179	1870, 154	1875, 173
1861, 196	1866, 116	1871, 166	1876, 208
1862, 123	1867, 119	1872, 133	1877, 249

Thus, taking no account of decrees *nisi*, the average of divorces for the twenty years is about 148. The numbers for the year 1878 and 1879 we have not obtained, but a statement in the *Times* of August 16, 1880, gives roughly the data from Michaelmas 1879 to Trinity 1880: 'entered and disposed of,' 643. Of these 63 were for judicial separation; 13 for nullity

had to discuss the various stages of that Bill under the evil and malign influence exercised by the unconstitutional presence of the Sovereign' (*Guardian*, 1857, p. 628). Our own times have witnessed the discussion in the same House of moral questions, not less important than Lord Roos's divorce, under 'influence' of a somewhat similar kind, which might be characterized in less severe, but yet in somewhat similar, language.

¹ Morgan, *Doctrine and Law of Marriage*, vol. ii. pp. 239, 240.

² There must, we presume, be some special and exceptional reason for this low number, which considerably depresses the general average of for the twenty years. The decrees *nisi* in the same year numbered 137, and the petitions for dissolution, 236.

of marriage; 'about as many' where the Queen's Proctor intervened to dismiss the suit. Deducting these, about 554 are left, in which, says the *Times*, 'with very few exceptions' the decrees were made absolute. This shows an immense increase.

Such tables, however, by themselves exhibit only part of the mischief. From 1861 to 1876, 696 divorced men or women 're-married' (according to the Registrar General's Report for the latter year), of whom 13 only intermarried, leaving 683 cases in which divorced persons contracted unions outside their own ranks, thus involving with themselves a like number of the unmarried or widowed in the sin of adultery, by the permission of the civil law.

We have no intention of wearying our readers with statistics, and willingly leave these facts to tell their own tale, and to suggest the painful and ominous reflections to which they cannot but give rise in thoughtful Christian minds. A writer in *The Church and the World*, in 1868, calculating the annual average of divorces at about 180, describes it as 'absolutely insignificant, if we could be sure that it would never materially increase' (p. 215, *note*). But though relatively insignificant when compared with the annual average of marriages, we are hardly prepared to go so far as he does, when we consider all its consequences, direct and indirect, and the fatal certainty that even if the numbers should not materially increase (as they probably will), the laxity of morals must surely grow with longer familiarity with vice, now that it has been firmly established by law as an ordinary element of our social system. And greater corruption in morals will find expression sooner or later in one of two ways, either in forcing greater laxity into the law, or in immoral living in contempt of law; possibly in both. Development in the former direction we see in many, mostly Protestant, European nations, and in the United States; in the latter direction, the example of France, where divorce is not legalized, is so eminent, though probably not alone, in evil, as to warrant the terrible cynicism of M. Naquet:—

'Si le divorce n'est pas réclamé aujourd'hui comme il l'était en 1792, comme il l'a été pendant quelque temps après son abrogation, on peut l'attribuer à ce que, n'ayant plus l'espérance de son rétablissement, on a arrangé la société de manière à pouvoir s'en passer. . . . On a fini par considérer le concubinage, les unions clandestines, comme plus commodes que le divorce, et l'on a jugé inutile de réclamer une institution dont on ne voulait plus se servir désormais.'¹

¹ *Le Divorce*, pp. 2, 3.

The dangers to which the purity of marriage is exposed in our own country may be classed under these heads: 1. Those resulting from the state of the existing law. 2. Those which would result from an extension of that law in the direction of further facilitating, or multiplying the legal grounds of, divorce. 3. Or from a relaxation of the prohibited degrees. There is further another danger, which we shall content ourselves with merely pointing out. We mean that which may arise from the acceptance of pernicious and immoral principles of 'social science' or 'political economy.'

1. On the first we need add but little to what has been said already. Most of the evils which the present law of divorce tends to foster are tolerably obvious. Setting aside the consideration of the mass of actual sin which it involves, it evidently tends to break up family life, to bar the way against repentance, forgiveness and reconciliation, and so to drive sinners to recklessness and despair. But it also indirectly promotes the formation throughout the land of adulterous households and families under the recognition of the law, productive of the worst influence on children, servants, dependents, neighbours, friends, and society at large. And even if for a time society should seem shy of such persons, we know there will be a constant pertinacious effort to force themselves into social recognition, which in the long run, backed up by the law as their position is, is pretty sure to be successful. Such position will become one aspect of ordinary society, and if those who occupy it conduct themselves with outward decency, especially if they are benevolent and 'charitable,' and take pains to make themselves as agreeable as they can, the easy-going indifferentism of the world will ere long find it less troublesome and more personally pleasant to 'let bygones be bygones,' and take them at their own valuation of themselves. So it has been over and over again in the cases of those who have contracted incestuous alliances, and there is no reason why adultery should be treated more harshly than incest. Dr. Pusey has said: 'The English dislike giving pain, and they overlook almost anything when it cannot be mended. They shut their eyes to guilt as long as they can, when it costs them pain to own it; they overlook it when they can.'¹ This is the humble and charitable view; and 'in many cases it may be' (as Dr. Pusey says) 'not indifference.'² But we fear that society has not improved in morality since Dr. Pusey wrote this. At any rate,

¹ *Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister*, Pref. p. xiii.

² *Ibid.*

be the reason what it may, it is not likely to be more severe now.

2. The danger of a further extension of legal divorce in England may possibly seem chimerical; but we know no reason why it should be. What are the hindrances? We imagine only these: (i.) traditional habit, (ii.) religious objections, (iii.) supposed social expediency, (iv.) absence of demand. None of these, however, can be relied on. We care less and less for tradition in this progressive age; and, after all, no change of habit can be greater than that effected by the existing divorce law; while, as to the principle, it was conceded more than 200, if not more than 300, years ago. Religious scruples are still less likely to offer effectual opposition; for nothing is more evident to both the Christian and the man of the world, nothing is more boasted of by the leaders and exponents of public opinion, by the writers, talkers, 'thinkers,' and politicians of the age, than the general decay of dogma as a guide of men, and the loosening of the hold of religion and religious principles as such on the government of nations and the direction of political life. It is true for the world, though not true for the Church. But we are concerned with the world now, and must accept the fact as it is. Seldom has a statement been made at once more true and more pregnant with evil omen to the future of English politics than that 'frank acknowledgment' of Mr. Gladstone in one of the Bradlaugh debates in the House of Commons, thus reported in the *Times* of June 22, 1880:—

'There is a theory that it does not matter what god you worship, provided that you worship some god or other; and I must confess that, in my opinion, there is greater danger of irreverence and impiety in this kind of loose and rambling theory than there is in a frank acknowledgment of the absolute separation that has been drawn in the spirit of the law of this land, and, as I believe, in the letter of the law of this land, between civil duty and religious duty (cheers).'

In very similar language M. Naquet repudiates the intervention of religious considerations in the civil settlement of questions of marriage:—'Parce que les peuples modernes, même lorsqu'ils sont très-religieux, ont fait un dogme de la laïcité de l'Etat et separent absolument le domaine de la loi du domaine de la conscience' (pp. 30, 31). And again, in the same relation, he speaks of 'le grand principe de la séparation du temporel et du spirituel' (p. 34).

Thus much at least, we think, may be safely said: that should an extension of divorce be ever seriously proposed to Parliament it will not be discussed, and still less decided, on

grounds of religion and Holy Scripture. For good or for evil, the days of the religious government of States are over. Believing, then, that extended licence of divorce will never be refused on this ground, we can better estimate the importance of Lecky's remarks that—

'against these notions [of transient connexions and easy divorces] Christianity declared a direct and implacable warfare . . . It taught as a religious dogma, invariable, inflexible, and independent of all utilitarian calculations, that all forms of intercourse of the sexes, other than life-long unions, were criminal . . . There is probably no other branch of ethics which has been so largely determined by special dogmatic theology, and there is none which would be so deeply affected by its decay.'¹

The 'decay' in the sphere of politics is patent to all; it is not unreasonable to apprehend that the ethical effect may follow. 'The stringency of the Catholic doctrine,' he again says, 'which forbids the dissolution of marriage even in the case of adultery, has been considerably relaxed by modern legislation, and there can, I think, be little doubt that further steps will yet be taken in the same direction.'²

We will adduce one more testimony, from the pen of an enemy, that moral restrictions on marriage are in great measure attributable to religion, and with the decadence of religious influence will themselves perish.

'A certain impurity is even now attributed by many to sexual relations, saving through marriage contracted with religious forms; and we are not far distant from those times when the colonists of New England spread terror by their inquisition to punish fornicators.'³ Even at the present day there are laws unrepealed against concubinage in certain Catholic countries; but, like all absurd enactments, they are virtually a dead letter. To what are these notions traceable? We have no hesitation in replying, to the Jewish religion and to its outcome, the Christian, as it was built up by the disciples of the Founder.'⁴

We think, then, that there is great reason to apprehend an increase of laxity in these moral matters consequent on the relaxation of the grasp of religion on the domain of politics; and the restraints of religion being set aside, is there any good ground for thinking that mere political expediency will be a sufficient protection to the existing marriage law? Can we be confident that the bounds set round the liberty of

¹ *European Morals*, vol. ii. pp. 350, 351 (4th ed. 1880).

² *Ibid.* p. 353.

³ We shall see further on that the New Englanders have 'progressed since 'those times.'

⁴ *Philanthropus*, p. 39, *seq.*

divorce will never be widened? We apprehend there is no ground whatever, but much to the contrary. Marriage will be regarded more and more as merely a 'civil contract;' and then reason and consistency will agree in demanding that it shall follow the law of contracts, and like other contracts be terminable at the will of the contracting parties.

There seems to be some difficulty, or at least some obscurity, in the way in which marriage is regarded by our law in its aspect as a contract. According to Blackstone 'our law considers marriage in no other light than as a civil contract. The holiness of the matrimonial state is left entirely to the ecclesiastical law; the temporal courts not having jurisdiction to consider unlawful marriage as a sin, but merely as a civil inconvenience. The punishment, therefore, or annulling of incestuous or other unscriptural marriages, is the province of the spiritual courts.'¹ Some have represented this statement as denying to marriage in the eye of the law any but a merely civil character. But Blackstone does not say this. He grants that marriage has a 'holiness;' that 'unlawful marriage' is 'a sin,' and liable to 'punishment.' He only says that the *temporal* courts have not jurisdiction to take cognizance of it in these lights, but that this is the province of the ecclesiastical courts. Morgan is quite right in saying, therefore, that 'the law, as explained by its luminous commentator, does contemplate the civil contract of marriage principally, but not merely or exclusively, or without such restrictions as are sufficient to sanction the doctrine of the Divine institution.'² It would, indeed, be difficult to maintain the 'exclusively civil' theory so long as the Marriage Office remains part of the law of the land by the Act of Uniformity.

Blackstone's distinction, however, is abolished by the Divorce Act of 1857. This enacts (s. 2) that all the matrimonial jurisdiction exercised by the Ecclesiastical Courts, except so far as concerns giving of marriage licences, should cease to be exerciseable by those Courts and be transferred to the Divorce Court. Either, therefore, this Court takes cognizance of the 'holiness' of marriage and of 'unlawful,' 'incestuous or other unscriptural marriages,' 'as sin,' in which case marriage cannot any longer be regarded by 'our law' as only 'a civil contract,' or else its character as a 'Divine institution,' though recognized by statute, is not cognizable judicially by any legal authority.

Marriage is, by general consent, spoken of as a contract.

¹ 1 *Black. Com.* c. 15 [quoted in *Morgan*, vol. i. p. 53].

² *Morgan*, *loc. cit.*

But the term has given rise, it may be thought, to much misapprehension of a mischievous tendency. For example, in the *Report of the Royal Commission on the Marriage Laws* it is taken for granted that, if 'mutual consent be the essence of the contract,' 'marriage is essentially a civil contract.'¹ But the conclusion is a thorough *non-sequitur*. Whatever may have been the view of the temporal law, it is certain that the Church, following the law of Christianity, never regarded matrimony as a civil contract essentially; and yet it is as certain that she considers mutual consent as the essence of the contract, so far as it is a contract at all. The case is well and tersely put by S. Thomas Aquinas: 'Consensus in matrimonio est causa . . . Matrimonium non est ipse consensus, sed quædam unio ordinatorum in unum . . . quam consensus facit.'² Consent is the essence of the contract; but, consent is not marriage, but makes it. In other words, marriage is not essentially a contract, but a state into which the contract of mutual consent admits. The difference may seem slight, but it is important. Regarded strictly as a contract, especially as a civil contract, it is wanting in several characters considered essential to all other contracts. Some of these are not unfairly stated by 'Philanthropus.' Among 'the general characteristics of a contract' he enumerates 'that its object shall be clearly defined and guaranteed by law;' 'that the contracting parties shall stipulate all the conditions,' and 'that the covenant shall be rescindible at will, and voidable through default of any substantial requisite' (p. 7). And after examining these and other characteristics *seriatim*, and showing how inapplicable, or at best how imperfectly applicable, they are to marriage, he concludes:—

'We deduce from the whole of the foregoing that marriage differs to such an extent from contracts in general, and even from those of association in particular, that it scarcely deserves the name of contract. And exactly those alterations required in the law, the better to adapt it to the welfare of the interested parties, would bring it closer to the contract of partnership or association to which it is usual to compare it' (p. 13).

It is, of course, undeniable that whatever may be the duties and mutual obligations of marriage, they are involved in the object of the contract; but, regarding the essence of the transaction, they are included implicitly, not explicitly, indirectly, not directly. They are inseparable from the state

¹ *Report*, p. 30.

² *Summa, Supplement. Tertiæ Partis, Quæst. xlv. Art. i., Conclusio.*

into which the contract admits, but their obligation rests primarily and supremely on their being duties of that state in the abstract, antecedently to and independently of any actual contract whatever; secondarily and incidentally only on their being virtually included in the contract of admission thereto. Lord (then Mr.) Justice Brett, in his Judicial 'Opinion' in the 'Mordaunt Divorce Case,' delivered to the House of Lords May 15, 1874, laid down the distinction with much force and lucidity:—

'By the law of England before the statute [the Divorce Act] the *status* of being a married person was during the life of both the parties to the marriage permanent and indelible. Marriage is not, as is often popularly stated, a contract. If it were, it could, according to every principle of the law of contracts, be rescinded by mutual consent. But it cannot. There is a contract before marriage, which is a contract to marry; but marriage is the fulfilment of that contract, which is then satisfied and ended, and there is no further contract. Marriage imposes a *status* which was by the law before the statute imposed upon the persons for ever. It could not be altered according to law. The law of England did not recognize the alleged hardship of being bound for ever to so solemn a condition as that of marriage, even though there was offence on one side or the other.'

The act of marriage, then, according to this doctrine, with which we entirely agree, at one and the same moment 'satisfies and ends' the 'contract,' and initiates the *status* with all its obligations.

The Marriage Office of the Church of England is in perfect harmony with this view. It is complete in itself. Whatever private or legal promises or contracts may have preceded, the Church, without slighting these, brings the whole transaction, as it were, into one religious focus. The contract to marry is formally solemnized *in facie Ecclesiae* by the mutual promise 'I will,' in reply to the question 'Wilt thou have?' Immediately on the promise comes the fulfilment, 'I take thee.' Then it is done. Then the priest, as the representative of Almighty God, declares that 'it is done;' that 'God hath joined together,' and forbids man to sunder. And these solemn words, it is worthy of notice, are addressed to no one in particular. The priest is not to say *to* any one, but simply to 'say.' It is a general proclamation by the King of Kings to all whom it may concern; to the whole kingdom and creation of God. After that, and not till then, the priest turns to the people there present and declares more particularly and specifically to them the same accomplished fact, pronouncing in

¹ *Times*, May 16, 1874.

the same awful Name, that since M. and N. 'have consented together in holy wedlock, and have witnessed and declared the same . . . they be man and wife together.'

Admirably as all this agrees with the doctrine that marriage is a holy 'estate' (as it is expressly termed half a dozen times in the course of the office) into which they enter by mutual consent and declaration, it is as unlike as anything can be to the notion that it is nothing but a contract, and above all a civil contract.

And here is the great practical difference. If marriage is a contract, its nature, obligations and privileges must be sought in the terms and conditions of the contract ; if it be an estate, they must be sought in the nature of the estate as instituted and expounded by its Founder. Those who explicitly or implicitly reject the testimony of the Christian revelation in the Word of God cannot do the latter, for what is sought for can be found nowhere else ; they are almost necessarily thrown back on the contract theory with all its consequences, of which, as Lord Justice Brett says, rescission by mutual consent is one of the most consistent and equitable.

From this notion of marriage being essentially a contract entered into by mutual consent for the happiness of the contracting parties, the wildest laxity has been derived and finds at this day, as in ages past, many vehement defenders. And the greatest misfortune is that there seems no logical halting-place when once the decline has commenced. Cut away the anchor which holds us to the revealed will of God, and where and how shall we stop ? As Lecky says :—

'We can prove that [the life-long union of one man and of one woman] is on the whole most conducive to the happiness and also to the moral elevation of all parties. But beyond this point it would, I conceive, be impossible to advance, except by the assistance of a special revelation. It by no means follows that because this should be the dominant type, it should be the only one, or that the interests of society demand that all connexions should be forced into the same die. Connexions which were confessedly only for a few years have always subsisted side by side with permanent marriages, and . . . it would be, I believe, impossible to prove by the light of simple and unassisted reason that such connexions should be invariably condemned . . . In the immense variety of circumstances and characters, cases will always appear in which, on utilitarian grounds, they might seem advisable.'¹

Such connexions, it is evident, could rest on no surer foundation than mutual consent or convenience ; and there is

¹ *European Morals*, vol. ii. pp. 348-9, 4th ed.

no essential difference in principle between them and marriages based on the same footing and liable to be similarly terminated. Of such, under the Roman Empire, Lecky observes: 'A laxer form, resting upon a simple mutual agreement, without any religious or civil ceremony, was general:' and then, after some important observations on the 'revolution which thus passed over the constitution of the family,' he adverts to 'a still more important consequence,' namely, that marriage,

'being looked upon merely as a civil contract, entered into for the happiness of the contracting parties, its continuance depended upon mutual consent. Either party might dissolve it at will, and the dissolution gave both parties a right to re-marry. There can be no question,' he adds, 'that under this system the obligations of marriage were treated with extreme levity.'¹

Nothing else indeed could have been expected. As soon as the idea is once entertained that marriage is a partnership by contract of two persons for mutual happiness, two results will surely work themselves out. First, mutual happiness will be interpreted by each partner to mean practically individual pleasure; and next, whatever interferes with the pleasure of either partner will be considered a sufficient ground for dissolution of the partnership. Causes of complaint, real or imaginary, will multiply indefinitely, and as happiness is altogether a subjective possession, it will be impossible for law or public opinion, or moral considerations, or any other external influence, to convince the one who wishes to escape that he ought to continue in his unhappiness. The mere desire of divorce would be sufficient ground for it.

And so we actually find it. M. Naquet, for instance, vehement pleader as he is for the introduction of freedom of divorce into the law of France, as '*une institution essentiellement moralisatrice*,' and while desiring the specification of many (and how many we shall presently see) '*causes déterminées pour lesquelles le divorce doit pouvoir être demandé*' (p. 99), not satisfied with these, boldly claims liberty of divorce without any reason assigned, and that by either partner, even against the earnest wish of the other. After arguing the question in his own way he sums up with great simplicity thus:—

'*Reste cette question : quand le divorce est demandé par un seul des époux . . . faut-il lui permettre de choisir entre l'allégation de causes déterminées ou la simple affirmation de sa volonté persistante,*

¹ Vol. ii. pp. 305-6.

comme l'avait voulu la loi du 20 Septembre 1792? . . . Je suis pour la solution de 1792' (p. 97).

The learned Frenchman's reasons for advocating supreme laxity in this matter are simple and trenchant enough. One is merely this, that the further one can get away from the existing law of prohibition the better: 'Je suis pour la solution la plus large relativement au divorce, par la raison que plus on multiplie les entraves à la faculté de divorcer plus on se rapproche de la loi actuelle, en diminuant d'autant les heureux effets que la loi du divorce ne peut manquer d'apporter.' Other alleged reasons are 'liberty' and 'civilization,' as thus:—

'Je suis pour la solution la plus large, parce que j'ai au plus haut degré le respect de la liberté individuelle, et que je ne saurais admettre, en aucun cas, que la loi puisse contraindre les citoyens corporellement dans un ordre de choses où en dehors de la libre volonté il n'y a plus que dégradation, immoralité révoltante' (p. 93).

On the same wide principle he defends the repudiation of an unwilling partner at the pleasure of the other:—

'Il est contraire au principe de notre civilisation actuelle qu'un homme ou une femme puisse être contraint corporellement; les contrats n'ont d'autre sanction que la condamnation à des dommages-intérêts ou des condamnations analogues, jamais l'obligation de faire ou ne pas faire. Le divorce est donc de droit lorsqu'un des époux l'exige, alors même qu'il ne s'appuie sur aucun motif légal pour l'exiger' (pp. 100, 101).

A franker exhibition of logical selfishness than this application of the contract theory it would be hard to find. And this is the system which is earnestly commended to the legislature of a country whose civilization and advancement Englishmen are so fond of lauding, in the interests, not only of 'liberty' and 'civilization,' but of 'morality;' because, forsooth, 'tous les citoyens ont un même intérêt à la moralisation de la société' (p. 2).

It is but one step from this doctrine to that of Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt, and of his commentator in the *Westminster Review*. Humboldt argues that—

'marriage must be attended with the most hurtful consequences when the State attempts to regulate it by laws, or through the force of its institutions to make it repose on anything save simple inclination . . . The radical error of such a policy appears to be that the law commands, whereas such a relation cannot mould itself according to external arrangements, but depends wholly on inclination; and wherever coercion or guidance comes into collision with inclination, they

divert it still further from the proper path. Wherefore the State should not only loosen the bonds in this instance, and leave ampler freedom to the citizen, but it should entirely withdraw its active solicitude from the institution of marriage, and both generally, and in its particular modifications, should rather leave it wholly to the free choice of the individuals and the various contracts they may enter into with respect to it. 'I should not be deterred,' he proceeds, 'from the adoption of this principle by the fear that all family relations might be disturbed or their manifestation in general impeded; for although such an apprehension might be justified by considerations of particular circumstances and localities, it could not be fairly entertained in an inquiry into the nature of men and states in general; for experience frequently convinces us that just where law has imposed no fetters morality most surely binds; the idea of external coercion is one entirely foreign to an institution which, like matrimony, reposes only on inclination and inward sense of duty.'¹

On which the *Westminster Review* comments thus:—

'As society is at present constituted, the full measure of personal liberty with respect to our sexual relations here contended for, unspeakably desirable as we hold its attainment to be, cannot, perhaps, be practically accorded. . . . But towards the attainment of it there is a growing movement, particularly in the United States, and to some extent in this country, and on the Continent . . . The primary objects of marriage are the happiness and comfort of the parties to it; and it is susceptible of every variety of form which their consent can establish if it be not contrary to these objects. The stipulations which the parties might see good to make with each other should be, like those of any other contract, capable of being legally enforced. Their terms, however, whether as to the incidents or the duration of the connexion, should be left to the choice and discretion of the parties themselves.'²

We may seem to have made a sudden and giant stride from such extremely restricted (as it must seem by comparison) divorce as exists in England, even if combined with the principle of 'civil contract,' to the wild and almost indiscriminate licence opened up by the demands of the writers we have latterly been quoting. So it may seem. But we do assert with all earnestness that, when the restraints of Christian doctrine and discipline are discarded, when marriage is looked on merely as a civil or social contract, for the happiness of the contracting parties, and for certain temporal ends and advantages mutually desired by them, there is no safe resting-place.

¹ Humboldt's *Sphere and Duties of Government*, pp. 33-35, Coulthard's translation.

² *Westminster Review*, January 1870, pp. 87-88.

In point of fact 'freedom of divorce' is but an euphemism for virtual 'abolition of marriage.' The greater the facility of dissolving the connexion, the more lightness must there be in forming it. Some men distinctly demand that marriage must be considered an experiment which may or may not succeed. One of these writers says:—

'Love is a combination of three sympathies, the moral, the intellectual, and the physical; and since it is impossible to develop these sympathies, or even to be certain that they actually exist, without the experience of intimate association, it is imperative that marriage should be, to a certain extent, a matter of experiment. Not only are human beings exceedingly liable to judge wrongly in matters of love, but moreover they are liable to develop in character unequally and in different directions; therefore the dissolution of marriage should be as free and honourable a transaction as its formation.'¹

But this is, as we have said, to demand the virtual abolition of marriage. Even atheistic writers see this clearly. One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, has said:—

'Divorce has in Germany and in other parts of the Continent been rendered very easily obtainable; incompatibility of temper being considered a valid cause for it. Now in reality *facility of divorce does away with marriage*; it thoroughly alters the theory of the institution, and makes it in reality nothing more than an agreement between two people to live together as man and wife so long as they love each other. And such is the only true mode of sexual union. . . . It is almost impossible *to alter at all without totally overthrowing* the theory of marriage. Easily obtainable divorce does virtually overthrow the theory of marriage.'²

Reference having been made more than once to the licence of divorce given by some Continental nations and the United States of America, it may be desirable to give some further particulars as to the extent to which it prevails in such countries. We have already mentioned the States in which divorces are legal.

In Scotland divorce is allowed 'for wilful or unjustifiable desertion as long as four years, if an order for adherence is

¹ It will be noticed that we do not give full references to all our quotations: to some, as to the present, none. The omission is intentional. The works are all published, some with the authors' names, some under pseudonyms, some anonymously; but while we are bound to use them fairly for purposes of quotation, we do not hold ourselves bound to direct the public to works which for the most part are little less than fountains of irreligion and immorality.

² The italics in this extract are in the original.

disregarded by the guilty party.¹ In Scotland, however, a person divorced for adultery cannot 'marry' the partner in sin: a restriction of which the Royal Commission of 1868 recommended the removal.

Belgium, Rhenish Prussia, and Baden retain the divorce law established in France (to which Empire they then belonged) in 1803 by the Civil Code. Several 'definite causes' are recognized, and, within certain limits, 'mutual consent.'

In Austria, for non-Catholics, divorce is allowed for—

'(a) adultery; (b) sentence to five years' imprisonment or upwards; (c) abandonment of the conjugal home; (d) absence in a legal sense; (e) snares to the risk of life or health of the other party; (f) frequent ill-treatment, and (g) uncontrollable and mutual aversion (which amounts to *mutual consent*).'²

In Switzerland 'since January 1, 1876,' the grounds have been much the same as the above, with the addition of 'insults,' incurable mental disease, and 'sentence to any defaming punishment.' Besides which the Court may grant divorce without such definite cause, if the 'conjugal bond is seriously impaired.'

In Germany the law varies in different States, but divorce is apparently allowed in all. In Prussia such causes are recognized as adultery, desertion, cruelty, 'snares,' repugnant [? repulsive] and incurable infirmities, grave insults, lunacy, high contentions, false denouncements of one partner by the other, dishonest acquisitions, deep aversion, mutual consent if there be no issue, and several others (p. 394).

In Russia, adultery, sentence to punishment involving loss of civil and political rights, absence as acknowledged by law (*i.e.*, absence for at least five years, the whereabouts of the absentee being unknown).

In Norway, adultery, absence without mutual consent during three years; absence for seven years, though without intention of abandonment, any repugnant (*sic*) and incurable disease existing previous to marriage, sentence to penal servitude for life. Divorce by mutual consent may also be had from the King under certain conditions involving much delay.

In Sweden, besides the usual causes, the husband may petition for divorce on the ground of his wife's unchastity before marriage not discovered till after it [answering to Dollinger's view of *πορνεία*]. Another ground is the husband's absence on public business, if 'unduly protracted.'

¹ 'Philanthropus,' p. 390.

² *Ibid.* p. 392.

In Denmark there are the usual grounds, adultery, desertion, &c., also mutual consent, which must, however, be preceded by a three years' separation.

In Holland marriage is dissolved by a ten years' absence of one partner 'and supervening marriage of the other;' also in consequence of judicial separation after five years, should one partner claim divorce and the other not oppose it. Other causes are such as we have seen elsewhere. Mutual consent, however, is not allowed.

In the United States, the grounds vary somewhat in the different States, but the list would be far too lengthy for insertion here. In one State only, New York, adultery of either party is 'the sole cause after marriage.' Instead of attempting classification of even the imperfect kind given above for other countries, we will transcribe from the author we have been following what he calls 'a collection of the entire series, so far as relates to specified causes,' premising that it does not exhaust those given in more detail elsewhere. They are as follows:—

'(a) adultery; (b) sodomy and other repulsive acts of incontinence; (c) physical and moral ill-treatment; (d) plots against life and health; (e) calumnious imputations; (f) desertion or mere absence for a certain time without permission of the other consort, or for a number of years conducing to an assumption of death; (g) condemnation to imprisonment or punishment entailing infamy or loss of civil or political rights; (h) contagious or repulsive maladies; (i) madness or other incurable mental disorder; (j) impotence subsequent to marriage; (k) serious and continued disputes; (l) habitual drunkenness and libidinousness of conduct [these, however, are separable causes]; (m) impurity of the woman prior to marriage, and evidence of lasciviousness afterwards, though not amounting to adultery; (n) neglect of the husband in not providing for the support of the family; (o) want of permission of the parents, if the woman is under fourteen years of age; (p) unlawful acquisition of property; (q) frequent exhibitions of ill-temper; (r) entering a religious society which condemns a married life; (s) flight from justice for repugnant (*sic*) crime; (t) vagrancy of the husband; (u) very reprehensible conduct in either of the consorts; (v) unconquerable hatred.'¹

To these must be added at least two; viz., voluntary separation for five years, and mutual consent persisted in after six months.

The list is simply appalling. The author allows that some items are vague and might lead to abuse, and so he would not recommend this catalogue as it stands, but he

¹ 'Philanthropus,' pp. 288-9.

adds, 'though long, it is not complete; and the experience of known cases, as well as the suggestion of possible ones, is yet able to supply much that is wanting' (p. 289). On the whole he remarks:—

'When all these legislations are laid before our eyes, whilst we wonder at the diversity of the causes of divorce, it is seen that they all have in view the same end; and therefore it is time to reflect whether the most sensible method of bringing them into harmony would not be to borrow from one what has been omitted in the other and tends to the same common end, which is to remove from married life the torments with which it is usually surrounded' (pp. 287-8).

M. Naquet seems no less enamoured of these 'liberal' laws; he would accept all and add thereto:—

'Il faut conserver le divorce pour causes déterminées, et je pense même qu'il faut accroître le nombre des causes déterminées pour lesquelles le divorce doit pouvoir être demandé; qu'à celles qui étaient admises par la loi française de 1803 il faut ajouter celles qui sont admises par les lois prussienne, suisse, américaine, et une cause nouvelle qui ne se trouve encore dans aucune législation; les dissentiments religieux entre époux survenus consécutivement au mariage' (p. 99).¹

Well, now let us turn for a few moments to the practical question, How do these laws work? Do we find that in America, for example, all these facilities of divorce tend to produce the happy and 'soul-conjunctive' unions which all in theory admit to be the ideal, religious or sentimental, of married life? And here we find a sufficient answer ready to our hand in the third paper, the title of which we have prefixed to this article. It is in many respects a remarkable article and full of warning to those who like ourselves have comparatively lately taken the first distinct step on the downward path. The writer, Dr. Nathan Allen, confines his investigation to the States of New England, or rather more accurately to four of them, Massachusetts, Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island; statistics of the divorces in

¹ Our 'Philanthropist,' however, objects to this as too niggardly, saying of M. Naquet's proposal: 'That writer does not take into account the religious difference existing prior to marriage, but that only which supervenes; and we see no motive for it. It is very possible (and we know it from experience) that two persons of different religious creeds may marry without apprehending any ill-effects arising from that cause, and afterwards discover that they are not so tolerant as they thought. Without exactly changing religion, and perhaps nominally professing the same, one party may become less fervent, and the other more enthusiastic, from whence spring incessant discussions or controversies, as bitter and interminable as disputes of this kind invariably are' (pp. 295-6).

the two other States, Maine and New Hampshire, being more difficult to obtain. Of these two Dr. Allen says in general terms, 'It is well known that the laws on divorce there are liberal; the causes allowed, numerous; and divorces are of frequent occurrence, probably as much so as in the other New England States.'¹ As regards the other States, it appears that between 1860 and 1878, both inclusive, there were in Massachusetts 7,233 divorces; in Vermont, 2,775; in Connecticut, 7,781; while in Rhode Island, from 1869 (before which year no regular divorce reports were made) to 1878, there were 1,866. During the same periods the numbers of marriages were, in the four States respectively, 258,550; 48,858; 84,153; 24,039. Thus the ratio of divorces to marriages stands in Massachusetts at 1 to 35.7; in Vermont, at 1 to 17.6; in Connecticut, at 1 to 10.8; in Rhode Island, at 1 to 12.9 nearly.

But, Dr. Allen observes, these reports come short of the truth. 'It is a well-known fact that many persons go from New England to the West to obtain divorces, because the laws in most of the Western States are more favourable to their designs' (p. 550). It is not unreasonable then to conjecture that, had we before us the statistics from the Western States, the proportion in them would be still higher; not only because of the immigrant cases, but on the broad principle of demand and supply, the facility of obtaining divorces being a fair evidence of the demand for them on easy terms.

But this is not all. Dr. Allen maintains that all the [Roman] Catholic marriages should be deducted from the total before the ratio of divorces to marriages is calculated, on the ground that 'the Catholic denomination denies the validity of all divorces obtained by process of the courts,' and that it is 'certain that in the divorces reported, not one can be counted as coming from' their 'marriages' (p. 556).² We

¹ *North American Review*, June 1880, p. 550.

² He adds somewhat inaccurately that according to the Roman ideas the bonds of marriage 'can be severed only by order of the Church;' the fact being, of course, that theoretically they are altogether indissoluble. M. Naquet, indeed, says that under cover of the various pleas for 'nullity of marriage,' of which there are fourteen, the difference between annulling and dissolving matrimony has become to some extent 'une affaire de mots,' and that practically the ecclesiastical law 'est infiniment plus libérale que notre code' (Pref. p. 6). This, however, must be taken mainly as an *argumentum ad invidiam* to an irreligious audience. Nevertheless, the Pope has quite recently gone far to justify the taunt of 'une affaire de mots,' in the case of the Prince and Princess of Monaco, to facilitate the union of the wife with another man. It may be doubted

are glad of it ; but we believe that the Roman Communion is not alone in America in maintaining the indissolubility of marriage, and therefore we can regard its members only as one portion of the population to which, as they do not avail themselves of the law, the law is virtually a dead letter. But we do not see that this constitutes any reason for their exclusion from the statistical tables. All we can say is that *if* members of the American Church avail themselves of the licence of the civil law, we can but wish that they were as consistent as the Roman Catholics. With these deductions, however, Dr. Allen makes the ratio stand thus : 'In Massachusetts, 1 to 15 ; in Rhode Island, 1 to 9 ; in Connecticut, 1 to 8 ; in Vermont, 1 to 13' (p. 557).

Whichever way we take it, the results are terrible to contemplate. They become yet more so when we take account of several points urged by Dr. Allen. Such are these :—1. That 'the rate of increase in each State is steady and remarkably uniform.' 2. That 'the whole course of legislation in these States for thirty or forty years has been to open the door wider and wider for divorces by multiplying causes and removing restrictions' (p. 552). 3. That 'complaints are frequently made soon after marriage, though it may require years before they are brought into court.' 4. That 'more than one-half the divorces are obtained within eight and ten years after marriage.' 5. That whereas at first they were thought to be confined principally to the more vicious ; and a strong sense of indignation against them existed in the public mind ; now 'the sentiments of the people have changed ; divorces have become more common, and no class in society is exempt from them' (p. 555). 6. That the changes in the laws making divorce more easy have been effected for the most part within the last twenty years. And, which is particularly observable, 'this new legislation was undoubtedly intended in each instance to meet a particular class of cases, and the agents in securing this change of the law were generally parties seeking a divorce, or their friends or attorneys' (p. 557). Dr. Allen very pertinently comments on this :—

'All persons who have had any experience in such matters, and know the peculiar arts or means employed to influence legislators, understand at once how easy it is to effect a change in the laws, especially on subjects where the particular points and the effects of

whether one such case as this will not go far towards counteracting the moral value of the Encyclical.

such changes are not understood or well considered. Thus, in extending and liberalizing the divorce laws, the designs of individuals and the effect of such changes upon society have not always been taken into account' (p. 557).

We, in England, have had experience of this in relation to the 'Wife's Sister' Bills; and Dr. Allen's cautions are exceedingly well-timed.

There is also another way in which the multiplication of causes of divorce acts most prejudicially. To this Dr. Allen draws attention:—

'It is well understood that the causes alleged are not always the *real* causes. Married parties, finding incompatibilities or disagreements of *any* kind to exist, or thinking a union with some other party would be productive of more pleasure, soon look about to see what provision the law makes whereby a separation may be effected. Of course they select those provisions in the law which apply most conveniently to their own case, and can be used to the best advantage Wherever one party is determined on separation, and understands the law in such cases, it is not difficult to originate causes, and is certainly easy to aggravate them. Supposing both parties are intent upon separation, they are quite willing to use the means' (p. 553).

This 'willingness to use the means' is one of Naquet's arguments for granting divorce on no reason assigned, on the ground that to demand causes is a direct incitement to any one 'determined on separation' to 'originate' them.

'In New England for 200 years very few divorces were sought or obtained,' says Dr. Allen. 'Far greater sanctity was then attached to marriage . . . As changes in the law occurred, and more liberal provisions were made for divorce, marriage has been regarded more as simply a civil contract. It is a kind of partnership intended only for the convenience and interests of the parties concerned.' 'The law forbids bigamy and polygamy, but tolerates a succession of partners' (p. 558). It is the same story in all essential features all the world over where the Divine institution and law of marriage are disowned. 'Among no Christian or civilized people at the present day,' says Dr. Allen, 'do we find divorces sought and obtained to such an extent as now in New England; and in only three instances in the history of nations can we find such a breaking up of the family by this means' (p. 560). The three are the commencement of the falls of Greece and Rome, and the beginning of the great French Revolution in 1790. Of this last period Dr. Allen says: 'Within a year and a half more than 20,000 divorces were granted; but even these, in

proportion to the whole population of France at that time, are not equal to the ratio of divorces to marriages as now found in Rhode Island and Connecticut' (p. 561).

The mode of administering the divorce laws, as described by Dr. Allen, is as reckless as the laws themselves. He says :—

'The modes of trying divorces are similar in all the States. The judges of the Supreme Court are constituted a tribunal for this purpose. The cases are usually tried in private, and generally the side of the petitioner only is heard. The law requires that notice should be sent to the defendant, who seldom if ever attends, so that there are no witnesses or cross-examination As no provision is made for the court to sit expressly for hearing divorce cases, the petitioners are obliged to catch the opportunity between sessions or at their close. Nearly unlimited power is committed to the judges, more so than in almost any other suits' (p. 555).

Under such circumstances it is the more remarkable that Dr. Allen should be able to say, 'The figures do not show how many apply for divorce without obtaining it. The records of the Courts, in some of the States, show that full one-quarter of the persons applying for divorce fail for various reasons' (p. 550).

Dr. Allen then passes on, in close connexion with this subject, to speak of the almost stagnation in some places of the increase of the native population; a fact of which we have been aware for a considerable time. On this head Dr. Allen gives grave warnings, not only on moral, but also on physiological grounds. Meanwhile, on one point, we feel constrained to supplement the information given by Dr. Allen with a caution amounting to obscurity by adducing the testimony of another American physician, Dr. George Napheys,¹ who writes as follows :—

'The detestable crime of abortion is appallingly rife in our day; it is abroad in our land [America] to an extent which would have shocked the dissolute women of pagan Rome. Testimony from all quarters, *especially from New England*, has accumulated within the past few years to sap our faith in the morality and religion of American

¹ It may be well to say that the work from which we make the ensuing quotation is the only one of the author's writings with which we are acquainted except by name (with one very trifling exception). We cannot say that we regard it without some misgiving here and there: and his works are considerably quoted by writers of very questionable character (not always, we suspect, quite fairly). But it is just to say that nothing in the book we do know is, in our opinion, incompatible with the purposes and spirit of an upright conscientious man dealing with important questions of extreme difficulty and delicacy.

women. This wholesale fashionable murder, how are we to stop it?'¹ . . . 'This crime is common : it is fearfully prevalent. Hundreds of persons are devoted to its perpetration. It is their trade. In nearly every village,' &c.²

We do not propose to pursue this part of our subject further. Enough has been said to indicate the danger of relaxing the law of divorce, especially on the basis of regarding marriage not as a Divine institution governed by God's law, but as a civil or other merely human contract. Amid all the chaos of civil legislation we see only darkness growing ever more murky, with deeper depths of corruption, unfathomed and unfathomable, yet beyond. In the words of Fergusson :—

'According to views of expediency and internal policy, often doubtful and transient, each legislature, following exclusively its own objects, has not only laid down peculiar rules, but has changed these from time to time, as the circumstances of its own subjects happened to alter. Hence, in these municipal rules there is so little of fixed and essential principle, that a collection of the whole, even upon the single article of divorce, would at first sight appear little better than a ludicrous exhibition of human inconsistency and caprice.'³

Morgan well adds, 'In the fluctuations of human legislation on the subject of divorce, and in the precarious tenure of the bond of marriage considered merely as a civil contract, it is the more necessary to insist on the true principle of its Divine institution.'

If it be said to all this : 'Be it so ; still there is no fear of any such evils being tolerated by law in England,' we can only ask, Why not? The first step has been taken already by the Act of 1857. How do we know it will be the last? We say with Dr. Pusey—

'Have Englishmen alone the power to stop where they will? Have they a privilege of their own to break down the first barriers, and then to stop inconsistently, although they shall have put it out of their own power to plead either the Divine Law or the rule of the Church, or instinctive feeling, which they would have already violated, as a ground against further changes?'⁴

We may think ourselves secure now, but we have not been tried yet. The strain has not come on us : the question is, What would happen should it come? What would be the

¹ *Physical Life of Woman*, p. 88 (Hardwicke, 1872).

² *Ibid.* p. 93.

³ Fergusson's *Reports of Consistorial Decisions*, p. 183; quoted by Morgan, vol. ii. p. 3.

⁴ *Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister*. Preface, p. xxxix.

result, let us say, of such an agitation for more facile and extended divorce as we have been contending with for many years as to the prohibited degrees? That such a demand has not been made may be attributed to various causes: partly, we think, to the circumstance that the energies of the opponents of Christian marriage have been concentrated, so far as regards their public and legislative activity, on the one Bill which by God's goodness they have not yet succeeded in carrying. Let them once succeed in this, and they will not be long ere they begin another.

3. Thus far we have been considering dangers to marriage from the direct alteration of the present law of divorce. There are other dangers not less serious and even more imminent from the threatened alteration of the law as to prohibited degrees. From this God's mercy has as yet preserved us. It is not easy to calculate the extent of the evil which a change of the civil law in this matter would entail. As we stand now, our law is in exact accordance with the Word of God, which is so far a better position than that which we occupy in regard to divorce. The exactness of this accordance is excellently shown in a paper by Archdeacon Hessey, published many years ago by the Marriage Law Defence Association, but now we fear out of print. It would be quite worth republication.¹ The fundamental principle which governs all these prohibitions is simplicity itself. Husband and wife are one. Her relations are the same to him through her that they are to her immediately by community of blood. To allow him to marry one of her relations in a degree which, *sexu mutato*, would exclude her from such marriage is in truth to deny the one-ness between him and her. As divorce denies the permanence, so relaxation of the 'degrees of affinity' denies the truth, of the marriage union. There is an unity in marriage, an essential one-ness, antecedent to, independent of, and over and above, the 'one-ness' of flesh, and *this* unity is marriage in essence; the later, the bodily, only its 'consummation.' 'He which is joined to a harlot is one body; but he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit,' though not one spirit only; for 'we are members of His Body' also. It is the union of Christ and the Church which is the antitype of the union of marriage. And therefore it is said no less significantly than exactly, 'A man shall cleave [not 'to a woman,' but] to his own wife (τῇ γυναὶ αὐτοῦ), and they twain shall

¹ The title is *A Scripture Argument against Permitting Marriage with a Wife's Sister. A Clergyman's Letter to a Friend*, p. 15.

be one flesh.' She is 'his own wife' before he 'cleaves to' her; that puts, as it were, the finishing stroke to, and perfects, the union. S. Thomas Aquinas states this well on the question, 'Utrum carnalis commixtio sit de integritate matrimonii.' His conclusion is, that it is not of its essence. The reason:—

'Quod duplex est integritas. Una quæ attenditur secundum perfectionem primam, quæ consistit in ipso esse rei. Alia quæ attenditur secundum perfectionem secundam; quæ consistit in operatione. Quia ergo carnalis commixtio est quædam operatio sive usus matrimonii, per quod facultas ad hoc datur; et ideo carnalis commixtio erit de secunda integritate matrimonii, et non de prima.'¹

If the union of Christ with His Church, and so with every member of His Church (which is the same thing in miniature), be, as it is, the archetype and antitype of the marriage union, we may reverently observe that it is Holy Baptism which makes us His members till death, essentially one with Him; and the Holy Eucharist is that whereby, receiving His veritable Body and Blood, we are made *τέλειοι*, perfected, 'consummated.'²

What is the essence of the one-ness wrought by marriage we cannot say. It is something very sacred; that we know: and something in very close analogy to the sacramental one-ness between Christ and His Church; that we believe. But we cannot understand, and still less explain, it fully. Still, whatever it is, it is violated by any attempt to make marriage within the degrees of affinity less strictly limited than within the degrees of blood. If the Bill for legalizing union with a deceased wife's sister should become law, which God forbid! the first fatal step will have been taken in a new path of moral corruption, and the second great foundation of marriage will have been broken up—its unity. There will be no logical resting-place then short of the destruction of all prohibition of marriage on the ground of affinity. 'You must consider,' said Lord Selborne, in his speech, as Lord Chancellor, against the Bill, March 13, 1873, 'how far your principle ought to go, and I am sure you can never stop short

¹ *Summa, Suppl. Q. 42, Art. 4.*

² So Bingham:—'Believers were called *τέλειοι* and *τελειούμενοι*, the perfect; because they were consummate Christians, who had a right to participate of the Holy Eucharist, the *τὸ τέλειον* as it is frequently called in the Canons of the ancient Councils; where *ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον εἰσθῆναι* and *τοῦ τελείου μετέχειν* always signify participation of the Holy Eucharist, that Sacred Mystery that unites us to Christ, and gives us the most consummate perfection that we are capable of in this world' (bk. 1. c. iv. § 3).

of the abolition of all marriages of affinity' (*sic*).¹ And it is perfectly clear that he was right. The union can be permitted only on the ground that affinity is nothing at all, or at most a merely transient relationship which the decease of the wife destroys. But it would be just as true and as good reasoning to say the same of sisters or other relations by blood; that the relationship ceases when the connecting link has departed from this world: therefore, for example, that after the death of both parents, brothers and sisters by blood ought to be free to marry. In both cases the relationship once made is abiding. Nothing is, however, more obviously absurd in principle than to allow a man to 'marry' his wife's sister, but to forbid him to take her niece. It is clear that such an anomaly would not stand in England more than in Germany. There is no limit to the depravity which such a law would logically sanction.

On the divorce law as it now stands, it might have at once two serious effects. First this. At present 'incestuous adultery' is of itself ground for granting divorce on the wife's petition. A man sinning with his wife's sister may be divorced, and in that case cannot be legally joined to his paramour. But change the law of affinity, and though the husband should live in constant adultery with the wife's sister in his own house, no divorce could be claimed, for the incestuous adultery would be no longer 'incestuous' legally, but only simple adultery; on which ground alone the wife cannot claim.² And secondly, the husband might, perhaps, if divorced from his wife, 'marry' her sister, because she would be no longer a person prohibited to him *by law* were his wife dead. In fact (to show the monstrous lengths to which the law would on such change permit men to go) there would be no legal obstacle to a man running through a whole family of sisters in rotation without any one of them being removed by death, and even returning to his original wife at last. Principles are tried by extreme examples, and we believe this hypothetical case would be quite 'according to law.' It strikes us that not half enough stress has been laid, in the opposition to the Wife's Sister Bill, on the frightfully demoralizing effect it might have if worked in combination with even the existing Divorce Law.

¹ *Guardian*, March 19, 1873, p. 383.

² The case would then correspond with one 'where a husband carried on an adulterous intercourse with a servant in the same house where he and his wife were residing,' and 'it was held that, in the absence of any threats or acts of positive violence, his conduct did not amount to legal cruelty' (*Browne's Law and Practice of Divorce*, 3rd ed. p. 31).

But are we quite sure that, if changes as to the prohibited degrees are once begun, they will stop short at affinity? If they do it will only be, we venture to predict, in defiance of strong, though possibly not speedy, opposition. Limitations on the side of consanguinity are already ridiculed and denounced on grounds of so-called philosophy and science. It is nearly twenty years since a paper was read at a meeting of the British Association in support of the view that marriages of consanguinity are neither contrary to nature, nor, so far as observations on lower animals evince, attended by ill effects on the progeny; and, therefore, that, 'unless we are prepared to believe in two distinct physiologies, the same must be true of the human race.'¹ The exact meaning of the following sentence may be dubious, but it has a suspicious ring: 'There should be open competition for all men; and the most able should not be prevented by laws or customs from succeeding best and rearing the largest number of offspring.'²

The conclusion of a very lengthy, learned and elaborate inquiry, by another recent writer, is summed up thus:—

'We have seen that not one of the many reasons which have been advanced why marriage between near kin should be prohibited by the State can stand inquiry. We have seen that there is no natural horror of incest, and that many people have practised and habitually do practise it; while, on the other hand, we have seen that, whatever may be the reason of certain prohibitions which exist, they are certainly not due to any conscious or unconscious experience of any evil results.'³

His general principle seems to be that 'no marriage is prohibited by nature, unless the parties are of an age unsuited to each other' (p. 157). In practice he would prohibit marriage 'in the direct ascending or descending line, between brother and sister and uncle and niece; or those degrees which, as a rule, imply an unsuitable difference of age between the parties.' To be sure, uncle and niece are not always so unsuited, but generally they are, and it would not do to make distinctions. Brothers and sisters generally are well suited as to age, but still, as, if they might marry, 'they would do so while yet too young,' and as they 'generally do not desire it, it is as well to forbid it' (p. 357). Similarly, 'marriage between step-mothers and step-sons, or father and daughter-in-law should be prohibited, since they must usually be of an

¹ *Rep. Brit. Assoc.*, 1862, *Miscel. Communications*, pp. 104, 105.

² Darwin, *Descent of Man*, vol. ii. p. 403.

³ *Marriage of Near Kin*, by Alfred Henry Huth. Churchill, 1875, p. 353.

unsuitable age for marriage, but brothers and sisters-in-law should be allowed to marry, as they are usually of suitable age, and more nearly represent the deceased party than any other person could' (p. 358). In a word, marriage ought to be regarded as a mere question of scientific breeding of human beings.

If it be thought that we have here reached the bottom of the licence demanded in these days, we are afraid that those who think so mistake, but we do not purpose to go deeper.

Most seriously we repeat the question we have asked more than once already: If we begin to descend, where and how, and on what principle are we to stop? 'Nature,' savage or civilized, will give us no solid help. The histories of Rome, Greece, Persia, Babylonia, and other ancient nations, the customs and laws of barbarous people, as they are to be read, among other places, in Sir John Lubbock's *Origin of Civilization* and *Pre-historic Times*, and McLennan's *Primitive Marriage* (*passim*), present us with a medley at once bewildering and horrible. Such writers and writings as we have already adduced in these pages—and the like might be readily multiplied—indicate the direction taken by a large and influential portion of the intellect, philosophy, and science of modern days. Regarded from this point of view, we cannot help greatly regretting some parts of Lord Coleridge's recent speech in the House of Lords against the Wife's Sister Bill. His Lordship utterly throws on one side all religious arguments; because, though such reasons 'are no doubt binding on the consciences of those who believe in their existence, they have no force for those who do not;' as though the law of God, if it exists at all, has no authority of its own to demand obedience.¹ But what has he left to fall back on? Merely 'convention' and 'general sentiment.' Thus he says:—

'I freely admit that the whole question of marriage is more or less one of convention. Reflection shows us that there is with hardly an exception (parent and child is probably no exception) no abstract right or wrong in these things. The marriage law of any country, as to the degrees within which marriage is to be contracted, is the result of what the cultivated intelligence of that country thinks wisest and best for the regulation of that sacred and intimate relation from time to time. It is obvious that connexions from which we now quite rightly shrink, and which we quite rightly esteem as unholy and impure, and, therefore, as unlawful, were sometimes, must have been under some circumstances, pure, and chaste, and lawful. . . . You cannot argue conclusively from any former times: in this matter of

¹ See *Guardian*, June 30 1880, p. 868.

marriage you must get, if you can, at the general sentiment and aim at the general good, and you should maintain that which conduces to the general good and which the general sentiment approves.'

But suppose these two things should not coincide? If we understand the logical tenor of the above argument the answer will be: They must coincide, because the 'general sentiment' is the ultimate standard of right and wrong in these matters. And further, it gives us no reason why it is '*rightly*' that we shrink from certain connexions, and 'esteem them unholy and impure.' Why may it not be said that they who do not shrink from them, and do not esteem them unholy or impure, are only the forerunners of a new revolution in the 'general sentiment,' men in advance of their time, heralds of a new doctrine of the 'pure,' the 'chaste,' and the lawful?' What right have we to say that the Roman civilization was in this respect 'nobler' than that of the Ptolemies and the Persians, and not *vice versa*? What shall we say of the civilization of those to whom 'it seems the most natural thing in the world that a man should marry his younger sister, though marriage with an elder one is as repugnant to them as to us';¹ or of that of the Siamese, 'among the commoners' of whom 'marriage is not permitted within the seventh degree (nearer than third-cousins) of blood relationship; but the king may marry his sister, or his daughter;' or even his daughter by his sister?² Lord Coleridge speaks as though the permission of marriage between uncle and niece were a drawback to the nobility of Roman civilization: 'Yet to the Romans themselves,' &c. But the France and Prussia of to-day allow the same; and how are we to decide whether their civilization herein is more or less noble than our own? The truth is, that Lord Coleridge's theory simply lays the whole 'sacred and intimate relation' at the mercy of the moral vagaries which may happen to be dominant in any nation at any given time. And as for 'civilization,' it is no standard at all: ever shifting. Every nation thinks itself civilized; every century past was no doubt in its own day the ideal which 'the nineteenth century' is in ours. We shall be to our successors what our forefathers are to us.

We have already incidentally referred to the recent charge of the Bishop of Fredericton, delivered to his Diocesan Synod, but which his position of Metropolitan of the Canadian Church invests with peculiar interest. In form a Charge, in influence it may almost be called a Pastoral to the Province, and though

¹ *Prehis'*. *Times*, pp. 458, 459.

² Huth, p. 98.

much briefer than the Papal Encyclical, it is quite worthy of a place alongside of that document. Denouncing the attempts in the Legislature of the Dominion to sanction 'marriage' with the sister of a deceased wife, the Bishop says :—

'Where are we going to stop in this downward course of licence? Already our legislators propose to go beyond the demands of agitators of the question in England. One law is to sanction the marriage of a woman to a deceased husband's brother. "Why then," as Lord Hatherley says, "should not a man's own brother desire his daughter in marriage, or look even to the reversion of his wife?" We may be sure that ingenious arguments would be found even for this revolting connection; but some are prepared to go even beyond this, and even bid us be of good courage and dare to do what Paul tells us "is not so much as named among the heathen," to take in marriage our father's wife. This language has, I understand, been supposed to be said in a joke, as if no man would desire it. In most instances it would, no doubt, be improbable, but it is far from being impossible. . . . The fact is, that the transgression of a Divine law always proceeds in a downward course, and never ascends to the source of all purity.'

As to the Levitical degrees and their obligation, the Bishop's warnings are no less weighty, in particular as he directs them in great measure against the two popular theories which we have already discussed at some length, that religious considerations are to be excluded from civil legislation, and that marriage is but a civil contract. This is part of what the Bishop says on these points :—

'If we were not bound by the table of degrees in Leviticus, which is impossible to be proved, if that table be part of God's moral law, given for the guidance of other nations beside the Jews, as is there indicated, we are bound by a higher and holier law to CHRIST; and it would be a most strange argument that what the lower and less perfect rule of life condemns as immoral the higher and more perfect rule may allow. On this reasoning there is nothing whatever to prevent the legislative sanction being given to polygamy, man's passions being apparently the only admitted rule, and the Word of God being entirely thrown aside as the true basis of sound legislation in religious matters. . . . The general argument is, however, sought to be set aside by an assertion that marriage is simply a civil contract, and that, therefore, the legislature has no religious obligations to deal with. . . . This notion of marriage being only a civil contract, resembling the renting of a house or the purchase of a farm, only, be it observed, much more easily broken by cheap and easy methods of divorce, is merely another mode of getting rid of our obligations to the Divine law. In days of lawlessness each man has a grievance, and sinners now call their transgressions grievances, and desire to legalize and justify them. . . . and when they have transgressed they will seek a new law to suit their new passion.'

VOL. XII.—NO. XXIII.

D

Not the least valuable part of Bishop Medley's important Charge are the fearless and uncompromising directions given to his clergy for their practical guidance in the event of the alteration of the law in the Dominion. Noble words they are, worthy of all note :—

'You may now ask of me, perhaps, what are we, the clergy to do? I answer plainly, you are to decline to solemnize such marriages. If the State relax its obligations, and pronounces marriage a civil contract only, the Divine law and the law of our Church is still binding upon you. You are to be guardians, not betrayers, of public morals. Nor ought persons who live in incest to be admitted to Holy Communion.'¹

From all that can be gathered from the course of affairs, it is tolerably evident that God's Holy Ordinance of marriage is an object of enmity not in this or that isolated place only, but throughout the greater part of the civilized world. And such documents as the Roman Encyclical and the Canadian Charge are evidences of the increased urgency of the subject in the struggle of Christianity against the devil, the world, and the flesh. It is vain, and would be foolish in the extreme, for any branch of the Church to flatter itself that it is no concern of hers. In truth, the uprising against God's law of purity and against marriage as its guardian witness, is most intimately allied with that general spirit of communistic atheism which heaves in an ominous ground-swell around all the kingdoms of the earth. Lawlessness and licentiousness now, as ever, go hand in hand, and the leaders of the one are more or less avowedly leaders of the other also. All who are in any degree, consciously or unconsciously, fostering the spirit of either, are in equal measure fostering the spirit of both. Whatever their social position, their culture, their intellectual gifts, their vocation in life, it is the same.

And now, though very much still remains unsaid, we are compelled to conclude. The upshot of all we have written is to impress, as earnestly as we are able, on all who may read it, this great fact : that, if in all these sacred matters we will not be governed by the law of God, there is no other law by which we can be governed but that of the unruly wills and

¹ It is impossible to refrain from contrasting with these instructions the late advice given by the Archbishop of Canterbury to a couple living in incest, who wished to receive the Holy Communion and were properly repelled by their parish priest ; namely, to go to some place where their incestuous life was unknown, and where, therefore, their communicating would give no public scandal. And this when he could not even plead that 'the law' was on their side!

affections of sinful men. Whither these may lead us we have lightly indicated, not daring to say all we might have said. We are firmly convinced that if once we let go of the law of God, there is no sure resting-place for our backsliding feet, till we fall into the abyss of corruption. Of course we shall be told it is of no use to resist: that we cannot roll back the tide of 'progress' and 'liberty,' that we shall never 'at this time of day' get men to go back to the trammels of 'superstition' and the leading-strings of 'the nursery.' It may be so. It will be no new thing in the earth if perverse and ungodly men persevere to the end, and prevail almost to the end. What they are permitted to do, that no doubt they will do. Our duty is to be true to our heavenly Master and Lord through evil report and good report, through honour and dishonour. That is all. It is enough, God knows; may He grant us to be 'faithful unto death.'

ART. II.—THE RISE OF THE HUGUENOTS.

1. *History of the Rise of the Huguenots.* By HENRY M. BAIRD, Professor in the University of the City of New York. (London, 1880.)
2. *Mémoires de Claude Haton, contenant le récit des événements accomplis de 1553 à 1582 dans la Champagne et la Brie.* Publiées par F. BOURQUELOT. (Paris, 1857.)
3. *Histoire des Martyrs persécutés et mis à mort pour la vérité de l'Evangile, etc.* Par JEAN CRESPIN. (Genève, 1570.)
4. *Histoire des Protestants et des Eglises Réformées du Poitou.* Par AUGUSTE LIÈVRE, Pasteur. (Paris, 1856-60.)
5. *Les premiers jours du Protestantisme en France depuis son origine jusqu'au premier Synode National de 1559.* Par H. DE TRIQUETI. (Paris, 1859.)
6. *A History of the Huguenots of the Dispersion at the Recall of the Edict of Nantes.* By REGINALD LANE POOLE. (London, 1880.)

IF the deeply interesting history of the rise and decline of French Protestantism be not rightly understood at the present day, assuredly it will not be owing to any want of adequate materials for the task. During the last half-century an enormous flood of light has been poured upon a period that was already rich in such elaborate histories as those of De Thou

and La Place, of Agrippa d'Aubigné and Crespin, of La Planche and de Bèze. The whole collection of *Documents inédits sur l'Histoire de France*, in which Claude Haton's *Memoires* are published, comprises many quartos such as the entire correspondence of Henry IV. and the portfolios of De l'Aubespine and of Cardinal Granvelle, which are of priceless importance to the student of this epoch. Hardly inferior in value to these are the reports of the ambassadors of Venice, Spain, England, and the Pope at the Court of France to their respective governments. Private enterprise has vied with national endeavour, and the *Bulletins* of the Société de l'Histoire de Protestantisme Française, the *Archives Curieuses* of Cimber and Danjou, as well as the works of Haag, Bonnet, Herminjard, and the latest editors of Calvin, evince an amount of patient and laborious research for a fuller conception of which we must refer our readers to the preface and ample notes of Professor Baird's volumes. Of the use which Mr. Baird has made of such ample resources we can speak in terms of high commendation. If his work is written rather in the spirit of an advocate than in that of a judge; if on every page his innate and irrepressible sympathy with liberty of thought in its struggle against repression, with political freedom as opposed to despotism, with the Reformers rather than with the Roman Catholics, is open and undisguised; he at least gives abundant authority in support of almost every position he advances, and the ablest of those who may be disposed to combat his conclusions will find in his candour and unsparing research a foeman who is worthy of their steel. Without adopting all Professor Baird's decisions, it is with unfeigned diffidence we venture to differ at times from a writer whose indefatigable labour and literary ability as displayed in the work before us entitle him to an honourable place on the roll of American historians.

How difficult the task must be to exercise an unbiassed judgment, and to follow up the true thread of the narrative through the mass of contradictory and conflicting testimony supplied by contemporary authorities, is well illustrated by two of the works named at the head of this article. Throughout a thousand quarto pages Claude Haton has never a kindly word to say for the Huguenots, nor a breath of remonstrance for any of the cruelties inflicted on them which he records. No calumny of them is too monstrous to be believed, no epithet too foul to be applied. In his eyes nothing is wanted to make a Huguenot but to eat meat on fast days, to abuse, and if possible to plunder, the Church, to sing psalms,

and to despise good works. Their pretended religion is to him but a veil for shameless, indiscriminate, and unbounded lust. To Jean Crespin, himself a fugitive for conscience sake, it is a labour of love to recite the sufferings and dying confessions of the Protestant martyrs as of men who were precious in the sight of God and of His Church. In a few touching words he declares his pains to draw up a trustworthy history, not only from official records, but from the lips of those who were with them, and not unfrequently from fragments written in their last moments, for lack of ink, in their own blood. Yet those who are not deterred by the prolixity of Haton's diary nor by the portly size of Crespin's volume, if they are happy enough to meet with this rare treasure, will gain so vivid a picture of the time as can hardly be gathered from a modern history. We think few will begin Professor Baird's volumes without eagerly devouring their contents.

When Francis I. succeeded to the throne the power of the French monarchy was almost unlimited. The feudal system had been practically extinguished by his predecessors, and the holders of the great fiefs reduced to subjection. The privileges of the municipal towns lay at the mercy of the sovereign. The rights of the *tiers état* were utterly disregarded. For fifty years the States-General were never once convoked, and the power of the purse was so absolutely at the King's disposal that, when Charles V. asked Francis what revenue certain cities yielded him, his answer was, 'Whatever I please.' Not only was the royal despotism unrestricted, but it was borne with a submission that appeared spiritless or admirable according to the varying temperament of observant foreigners. The *noblesse* had shrunk from independent rivals of the sovereign into feeble imitators of the vices and extravagance of the Court. Trade was held in supreme contempt. The people had been deprived of arms, and the Venetian ambassador declared 'they dare not even carry a stick, and are more submissive to their superiors than dogs.' Only a few checks, portrayed by Mr. Baird with a skilful hand, in some degree qualified the royal prerogative. The various Parliaments (a term we must be careful not to confound with its modern English sense), the University, and the clergy, each exercised an influence that might at times be overborne, but could not be entirely overlooked.

The opening years of the reign of Francis I. were bright with promise. The King was believed to be imbued with the spirit of the Renaissance, and was at least ambitious that his reign should be illustrious in arts and literature as well as

in arms. His own education had been very imperfect; but he was largely influenced by his sister Marguerite, whose superiority in acquirements augmented and maintained the power which their mutual affection gave her, and which she uniformly exerted on the side of enlightenment and mercy. The invitation of eminent men to the Court, the foundation of the Collège Royal with its trilingual curriculum of education, the encouragement given to art in every form by the building of S. Germain and Fontainebleau, the pensions bestowed on literary merit: all these seemed to warrant the boundless eulogy which was lavished upon Francis, and to invest the gay monarch with a halo of glory which has faded before the clouds that darkened his later years or vanished under the critical investigations of modern research. Yet one of his first acts proved that Francis was prepared to sacrifice the highest interests of the kingdom to serve his own personal advantage. The liberties of the Gallican Church had been secured by the Pragmatic Sanction, and the nation had been relieved by the same instrument from a crushing burden of tribute to Rome. The measure had been maintained at no small hazard by the immediate predecessor of Francis, the stout-hearted 'father of his people,' and so Catholic a body as the Parliament of Toulouse had resisted to the utmost its repeal. How needful was its maintenance was made clear by the fact that

'in the three years during which it had been virtually set aside (1461-1464) Rome drew from the kingdom not less than 240,000 crowns in payment for Bulls for archbishoprics, bishoprics, and abbeys falling vacant within this term, 100,000 for priories and deaneries, and the enormous sum of 2,500,000 crowns for expectatives and dispensations.'¹

How deadly was the blow it aimed at Romish usurpation was evinced by the determination of Julius II. to deprive Louis XII. for upholding it of his prescriptive title of 'Very Christian King.' Yet the advantages secured with so much pains were abandoned by the concordat concluded between Francis I. and Leo X. The rights of the Church were sacrificed, whilst Pope and King divided the spoils. To the remonstrances of prelates and Parliaments Francis deigned but one uniform reply, 'You must obey: I am your King.'

The condition of the clergy throughout France had long been such as loudly to demand reform, and men who never dreamed of separation from the Church were urgent for a

¹ Baird, i. p. 33.

reformation in its head and its members. From no quarter had the demand been made with more ability and urgency than from the University of Paris, whose chancellor, Gerson, and whose rector, Nicolas de Clémangis, had exposed the existing abuses before the Council of Constance with an unsparing hand. Unhappily, the only change which time had wrought was not the removal of the evil, but acquiescence on the part of the University in its continuance. A few touches, supplied in part by the friendly hand of Haton, himself a curé at Provins, will suffice for our purpose.

'In proportion as the number of heretics in France increased, the prelates and pastors of the Church grew more indifferent to the discharge of their duties, from the cardinals and archbishops down to the most insignificant curés. They cared not how the common weal prospered, provided that they could only draw the revenues of their benefices at the places they preferred to reside in. They farmed out their livings at the highest possible price, regardless who held them so long as he paid the stipulated rent.'

The number of priests was very large in the towns and villages, which caused great competition for cures and priories, and very often the most asinine and stupid fellow (*le plus asne et mécanique*) in the place was vicar. Thus simony was rampant, and the lives of the priests were scandalous. Sword in hand, they were the foremost at dances and gambling, 'et es tavernes où ilz ribloient et par les rues toute nuit aultant que les plus meschans du pays.' It was vain to look to the leaders of the Church for example or redress when John of Lorraine, the most powerful ecclesiastic in France, held at one and the same time the archbishoprics of Lyons, Rheims, and Narbonne, and the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, Verdun, Thérouanne, Luçon, Alby, and Valence, and the abbeys of Gorze, Fécamp, Clugny, and Marmoutier, to which Leo X. graciously added a cardinal's hat *a year or two before he attained his majority*. Like priest, like people. The times were altogether out of joint. Haton's portraiture of the *noblesse* and the *bourgeoisie*, making due allowance for the temperament of a *laudator temporis acti*, is drawn in the darkest colours.

The first streak of dawn appeared at the episcopal city of Meaux, where Jacques Lefèvre and Guillaume Farel found an unexpected ally in Briçonnet, the bishop of that see. The new opinions were openly proclaimed in the pulpit of the cathedral, and Briçonnet won over a powerful protector to the cause in the King's sister. Lefèvre devoted himself to the translation of the Scriptures into French, and Francis declared it to be his royal pleasure that his people should hear and read

God's Word in their own language. Everything seemed to promise success, and the Reformers were exultant, when a storm of monkish and clerical wrath burst forth, and Briçonnet quailed before it and recanted. It is mournful to read that the Bishop's own prisons were speedily filled with members of his flock who faithfully obeyed his earlier exhortations that if he should ever abandon the truth they should not follow his example.

We have no space for a chronicle of the rapid changes made henceforward in the constitution of special courts for the suppression of heresy, nor of the vacillating treatment of it by the King, swayed now by his sister, now by the clergy, subsidy in hand, nor of the horrible and barbarous punishments borne with unblanching fortitude by martyrs of every rank, from Jean le Clerc, the wool carder, to the noble and learned Louis de Berquin. Whilst nothing can palliate the atrocity of such wholesale massacres as those at Cabrières and Mérindol, we must not, in our indignation at the record of suffering and torture endured by the Huguenots, judge the conduct of those in power at that day by the standard of our own, nor forget that the Protestant leaders acknowledged and exercised the right of every government to punish heresy with death. The necessity engendered by persecution for secret meetings under the cover of night gave a colour to like calumnies to those circulated against the early Christians. These calumnies were industriously spread, and no doubt largely and honestly believed. The pulpits rang with denunciations of the Reformed, and no sense of the sacredness of his position or calling checked many a monkish preacher in the utterance of broad and telling falsehood or of unblushing slander. In Paris especially the populace was aroused to intense hatred of the Huguenots. Yet, despite obloquy and suffering, they increased in numbers, and every martyrdom won fresh adherents to the new doctrine, when the heaviest blow to its advance was dealt by one of its own supporters.

‘Early on the morning of October 18, 1534, a placard was found posted upon the walls in all the principal thoroughfares of the metropolis. Everywhere it was read with horror and indignation, and loud threats and curses were uttered against its unknown author. It was headed, “True articles respecting the horrible, great, and insupportable abuses of the Papal Mass.”’

Some idea of its style may be gathered from the following extract:—

‘The Pope and all his brood of cardinals, bishops, monks, and canting mass-priests, with all who consent thereunto, are false prophets,

damnable deceivers, apostates, wolves, false shepherds, idolaters, seducers, liars, and execrable blasphemers, murderers of souls, renouncers of Jesus Christ, of His death and passion, false witnesses, traitors, thieves and robbers of the honour of God, and more detestable than devils.¹

The supposed consequences of the accidental consumption of the consecrated Host were pressed with revolting clearness, and the speedy destruction of Romanism was boldly asserted. To add to the effect produced by this most ill-advised and intemperate handbill, a copy of it was audaciously posted on the door of the royal bedchamber in the Château of Amboise.

If the rage of the populace of Paris was indescribable, the wrath of Francis was unbounded. His religious principles, his personal pride, his royal dignity, were all outraged, and swift and stern was the vengeance exacted for so gross an insult. Henceforth all intercession on behalf of the Huguenots was for a long season fruitless, and a bitter persecution raged almost without intermission to the close of the reign. New forms of torture were devised to aggravate and prolong the sufferings of the heretics. A royal edict, subsequently withdrawn at the repeated remonstrance of the Parliament, even prohibited any exercise of the art of printing in France on pain of the halter. A grand expiatory procession was organized for Thursday, January 21, 1535, in which the King, dressed in robes of black velvet lined with costly furs, devoutly followed the elevated Host with uncovered head and with a large waxen taper in his hands. At the conclusion of the mass, celebrated with unparalleled magnificence at Notre Dame, Francis thus addressed the judges of the Parliament of Paris: 'It is my will that these errors be driven from my kingdom. Were one of my arms infected with this poison, I should cut it off. Were my own children contaminated, I should immolate them.'²

Mr. Baird regards this scene as merely a well-studied theatrical exhibition, and seems disposed to sneer at the impression it is alleged to have made on the bystanders. It is, indeed, no hard task to contrast the patient courage of poor Huguenot martyrs with the perjury through which Francis obtained his release from captivity and the infidelity of his passion for Diana of Poitiers. Yet we think that his conduct on this occasion admits of a more natural explanation than that of studied hypocrisy. Amidst the strange contradictions of which human nature is capable, it does not seem to

¹ Baird, i. pp. 165-6.

² *Ibid.* i. p. 176.

us incredible that Francis should have believed that religion and policy alike demanded from him the suppression of the new opinions, or that his immoralities should have been followed by spasmodic fits of fervour, which found their vent in such self-abasement as his religious guides appointed or approved, or should have sought for expiation in the relentless prosecution of those he deemed enemies of his throne and of his faith.

During the entire reign of Henry II. the tide of persecution against the Huguenots rolled on in undiminished force. The King, who is described by the English ambassadors 'as a goodly tall gentleman, well made in all parts of his body; *a very grim countenance*, yet very gentle, meek, and well-beloved of all his people,' excelled in all bodily exercises, but was singularly sluggish and dull in mind, and was entirely ruled by Diana of Poitiers, the Constable Montmorency, and the Guises. A contemporary writer likens the band of courtiers gathered round this trio to swallows in pursuit of flies on a summer evening.

'Nothing escaped them—rank, dignity, bishopric, abbey, offices, or other dainty morsel—all alike were eagerly devoured. Spies and salaried agents were posted in all parts of the kingdom to convey the earliest intelligence of the death of those who possessed any valuable benefices. Physicians in their employ at Paris sent in frequent bulletins of the health of sick men who enjoyed offices in Church or State; nor were instances wanting in which, for the present of a thousand crowns, they were said to have hastened a wealthy patient's death. Even the King was unable to give as he wished, and sought to escape the importunity of his favourites by falsely assuring them that he had already made promises to others. Thus only could they be kept at bay.'¹

The avarice of these harpies was deeply interested in the condemnation of the Huguenots, whose confiscated properties swelled their coffers. The Cardinal Charles of Lorraine did not disdain to further his interests at Court by unremitting and obsequious servility to the King's mistress, nor to cheat the creditors of his uncle John, to whose benefices and personal wealth he had succeeded, of the enormous sums due to them. 'It were to be desired,' said a Cabinet minister who knew them both well, 'that this woman and the Cardinal had never been born; they two alone have been the spark that kindled our misfortunes.'²

Under the influence of such shameless counsellors blood

¹ *Mémoires de Vieilleville*, quoted by Baird, i. 273.

² *Ibid.* pp. 271-2.

flowed in every part of the kingdom. The press was watched and restrained with increasing severity. A chamber was established in the Parliament of Paris to deal with heresy, which speedily earned the popular title of 'la Chambre Ardente.' The ashes of one martyr were hardly cold before a new victim was found to succeed him. In the midst of so hot a persecution the Huguenot Churches of France were organized on the Presbyterian model, and the pious research of modern Protestantism¹ has decided that it was on May 25, 1559, that deputies from all the Churches of France assembled for the first time at Paris in the National Synod. It was almost at the moment when Anne du Bourg's fearless advocacy of liberty and truth so enraged the King that he swore to see him burned with his own eyes. What further injury was in store for the hapless heretics was but too manifest, when the spear of Montgomery wrought the unexpected salvation of the saints, or at least brought a temporary respite.

The death of Henry completely altered the balance of political parties, and gave weight to the Protestants as a counterpoise against the excessive power of the Guises. Indeed, at first it seemed as though the scale would be turned in favour of the Huguenots, and such would have been the case had Antoine of Navarre possessed enough of energy to grasp the regency, to which his birth entitled him, and enough of religious conviction to wield its authority on behalf of his co-religionists. But the weak Bourbon was no match for Catherine and the Guises, and during the ten years which closed with the Massacre of St. Bartholomew the policy of the Crown was chiefly swayed by the Queen Mother. Catherine adopted the maxim *Divide et impera* as her motto, and pursued her tortuous policy with a dexterity and cunning that was worthy of Machiavelli. It was natural under such a posture of affairs that the Huguenots should obtain some concessions. Catherine lent a ready ear to their complaints, professed to be not insensible to the exhortations of their ministers, and even let it be supposed that she might possibly become a convert to their doctrines. The tumult of Amboise, the meeting of notables at Fontainebleau, the colloquy of Passy, successively marked the giant strides made by the new opinions. Whole districts were won over. In March 1562 Condé furnished Catherine with a list of 2,150 fully organized churches. It was impossible that the system of unqualified

¹ Triqueti, *Premiers Jours*, p. 254.

repression should any longer be maintained, and at length, by the edict of January, which allowed them on certain conditions to meet for worship without molestation, the Huguenots ceased to be outlaws and could claim the protection of the law. Utterly imperfect as was the toleration thus accorded, the Catholic pulpits rang with denunciations of the Jezebel who had granted quarter to the accursed sons of Baal and had ordered 'the cats and the rats henceforth to live in peace.'

The edict of January was no sooner published than the Romish party strained every nerve to hinder its observance. Its conditions were utterly disregarded wherever the Catholics were in the ascendant, and the complaints of Condé were loud but unavailing. We can hardly wonder that a pacific solution should have seemed hopeless, but the wisest of the Protestant leaders at home and abroad, and especially Coligny, earnestly deprecated an appeal to arms. The relations between the two parties were already overstrained when the massacre of Passy caused the cup of Huguenot indignation to flow over. We must refer our readers to Mr. Baird's second volume for details of the varying fortunes with which the contest was for eight years maintained, of the conditions of the three successive treaties by which an insincere peace was again and again patched up, of the defection of Antoine of Navarre and the death of Condé and the murder of the Duke of Guise, of the ceaseless intrigues of Catherine de Medici, of the sieges of Sancerre, Poitiers, and La Rochelle, of the battles of Dreux, Jarnac, and Moncontour. It is a sickening record of atrocious excesses on both sides, but seldom relieved by acts of generosity or good faith, of capitulations based on solemn engagements that were shamelessly violated, of treaties concluded on carelessly debated conditions that were 'promised to the ear to be broken to the hope.'

The pages of Claude Haton supply superabundant testimony of the misery caused by the religious wars, and of the rapid and utter demoralization they produced.

'I can say nothing,' writes the indignant curé, 'about the Low Country nor about Poitou, where the rebel Huguenots were in force. I suppose they were neither more peaceable nor better than the King's troops, and that on both sides alike the best of them was not worth a rope with which to hang him. I respect some of the princes in arms on either side who yet allowed incredible evil to be wrought, for which they will be punished in another world. I know not whether God will not in the end inflict vengeance upon them for the unjust wars they have waged under the cloak of religion, and for the mas-

sacres, sacrilege, incendiarism, plunder, robbery, ransoms, violations, murders, wrought on the goods as well as the bodies of poor men, women, and children in places where they had authority and credit, and which ought to be a perpetual disgrace to them and their descendants for ever' (p. 801).

Incredible and unutterable atrocities with which we cannot defile our pages marked the passage of the German mercenaries. The roads were infested with brigands, the villages deserted, the towns crowded to overflowing—the buildings with the influx of strangers, the very streets with cattle driven in for protection—and pestilence soon followed on the track of war. Hardly any district of France escaped the universal devastation, and the troops were equally formidable to friend and foe. Hospitality was commonly requited with the plunder and consequent ruin of the entertainers. Wanton destruction aggravated the losses and misery of the peasantry. Those who had lost their all wandered naked and homeless, happy if they retained the covering of a shirt or escaped the torture commonly employed to extort a ransom.

'Barbarians, Jews, Turks, Saracens, and infidels would not have done more harm to the poor people than did the French soldiery. Many priests from Provins conducted themselves abominably, and by doing things which laymen would not have done occasioned grave scandal. A sad thing,' adds Haton, 'is war. I believe that if the saints in Paradise went to it they would speedily be changed to devils' (p. 850).

The eventual result of a struggle in which the odds seemed at first so terribly against the Huguenots was long in suspense; but the Catholic faction became convinced that it was hopeless to suppress their foes by open war. Coligny's heart was always inclined to peace, and its terms were promulgated on August 8, 1570.

On the conclusion of the peace of S. Germain the fate of Protestantism, according to Mr. Baird, still trembled in the balance, and it was no unlikely contingency that it should eventually prevail in France as it had prevailed in England. This estimate derives no slight support from so unsuspicious a witness as Claude Haton.

'One may say for certain,' he writes in 1569, 'that, had it not been for the people of Paris and the princes of the House of Lorraine, who are called the lords of Guise, the Huguenots would have gained and held the whole of France, would have abolished the Roman and Catholic Church, and would have deprived the King and his brothers of the crown of France' (p. 573).

If, as Mr. Baird concludes, Charles IX. accepted 'the limping and unsettled peace' in solid good faith; if, weary of civil war and its attendant anxieties, he longed to give rest to his kingdom; if the statesmanlike views, and enlightened policy, and lofty personal character of Coligny made a deep impression on the youthful King and contrasted favourably with the selfish and overbearing temper of the Guises, which had probably galled him at times; if, above all, as Mr. Baird stoutly maintains in contradiction to generally received opinion, Charles had not yet formed any design for the massacre, and was even hesitating between the conflicting teaching on doctrinal points of Rome and Geneva: the revolt of the Netherlands presented an occasion for the adoption of a policy which might have changed the face of Europe, might have avenged the victories of Charles V. and Philip II., and might have replaced France at once in the foremost rank amongst the Continental Powers. Such was the vision which Coligny unfolded to his royal master, and it is not a little humiliating to add that so fair a prospect was marred by the duplicity and penuriousness of the English Queen. *Dis aliter visum.* The opportunity passed away, never to return.

The question of Charles's complicity in a long-formed determination to exterminate the Huguenots presents a problem of no slight complexity, which must be decided by the weight of the evidence on either side, and cannot be settled by quoting an old Latin saw as conclusive of the young King's studied ill-faith. Many indisputable facts seem to point the other way. The young King's visit to Coligny after the abortive attack upon him, his alleged reluctance to countenance the massacre, the suspicious nature of the conspiracy which his mother and the Guises laid to the charge of the disabled Admiral, even his horrible personal participation in the act, his ruthless cruelty when once committed, his haunted remorse and dying despair, betoken a mind driven against its own better convictions to crime, plunging awhile in wild excess and awakening to a too late repentance. We can at least fully sympathize with Mr. Baird's desire to remove some portion of the guilt from a young monarch so infamously trained and guided as Charles had been, and one whose memory must even then remain terribly sullied. From the crime of complicity in the purpose formed long before to exterminate the Huguenots his contemporaries, and Haton amongst them, did not acquit their King: yet so inveterate is the blindness of religious bigotry that the chronicler of Provens could pen so horrible a sentence as the following:—

'*Fut une grâce de Dieu comment le Roi, en la jeunesse où il estoit, sceu si bien dissimuler avec le dit admiral, sans se soullier ni maculer en sa foi et conscience*' (p. 633).

The more important question why Protestantism, after having gained so strong a hold upon the nation, did not eventually prevail, is one to which Mr. Baird does not address himself in these volumes. Its comparative failure was hardly owing to the enmity of successive sovereigns, nor to the bitter persecution which they practised, nor to the extraordinary number of the hostile monks and clergy, whose proportion to the entire population is not a little startling to modern notions, nor even to the pusillanimous and repeated defection of trusted leaders. Each and all of these causes doubtless exercised an adverse influence against the new opinions; but they would most likely have advanced steadily, despite all these drawbacks, had it not been for the fatal mistake of the Huguenot chiefs in staking their cause upon an appeal to arms.

It is only, perhaps, by patiently wading through the prolix narrative of weary and minute details that we realize the endless sequence of mutual animosity, injustice, and misery which was engendered by the civil war. It is responsible for the iconoclasm of the more fervid spirits, which Calvin vainly strove to repress, but which found vent in the brutal and senseless destruction of countless works of art and beauty, and thus drove many quiet persons, through outraged feeling, from the cause which was disfigured by such excesses. It identified the Huguenot party with the misdeeds of all the needy and greedy *noblesse* who joined their ranks in the hope of plunder, and under whose rapacity chalice and crucifix, crozier and reliquary—the priceless jewels of the Church treasury and the pride of many a parish—disappeared in the crucible, to foster renewed robbery and sacrilege. It provoked, even if it did not justify, the frightful atrocities of the mobs of Paris, Toulouse, and other Catholic cities. It gave support to the calumnious assertion that Protestantism was inconsistent with loyalty, and rallied many a hesitating spirit in support of the throne against the Huguenots, as the Spanish invasion served the Protestant cause in England by giving it the right of appeal to the nation's patriotism. Add to the prejudice thus awakened against the Reformed the destruction of life and property, the irretrievable devastation that marked the war trail of either party, the insatiable greed of the German mercenaries, the universal suspicion, and the opportunity afforded by the general confusion to avenge private hatred, and

there is abundant material with which to aggravate a thousandfold the wretchedness endured by a people ground down by the tyranny of a lawless *noblesse* and deprived of the protection of a strong central government. All this misery was naturally laid by popular opinion to the charge of the Huguenots. Thus was begotten a popular aversion, which years failed to dissipate and which became a portion of the national spirit. Never was the Christian lesson more strongly impressed by the stern logic of facts that the servants of the Lord must not strive.

With this solution of our question we must close our survey of Mr. Baird's volumes. We shall await with much interest his continuance of the task he has commenced so well.

ART. III.—THE TARGUMS ON THE PENTATEUCH.

1. BUXTORF, *Lexicon Chaldaicum*, &c. (Basil. 1639.)
2. RITTANGELIUS, *Liber Jetsirah*. (Amstelod. 1642.)
3. TAILER, *Targum Hierosoly*. (Londini 1649.)
4. WALTON, *The Twelfth Dissertation, and the Targums in the Polyglot*. (London, 1657.)
5. WOLFIUS, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*. (Hamburg, 1649.)
6. PRIDEAUX, *The Old and New Testament Connected*, &c. (London, 1718.)
7. *The Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church against the Unitarians*. By PETER ALLIX. (Oxford, 1821.)
8. *The Targums on the Pentateuch*. Translated by J. W. ETHERIDGE. (London, 1862.)
9. *Remains of Emmanuel Deutsch*. (London, 1874.)

IT has been rightly said that the circumstances of the Israelites during their sojourn in Egypt and during the captivity in Babylon were different. In the former case they were isolated from the native inhabitants, living in a district by themselves, preserving their peculiar customs, and speaking their own language, the consequence being, that when they emerged from their bondage, they were as much a distinct nationality, as if they had never lived in a foreign land. During the captivity in Babylon, they were scattered over the country in detached settlements, so that they were brought into close

contact with their conquerors, and, from the necessities of the case, were compelled to learn their language, and to conform to some extent to their social customs. The Hebrew could not have been entirely forgotten, because otherwise the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel would have been unintelligible to the exiles, although it must have gradually ceased to be spoken. The Chaldeans who were sent to colonize the depopulated land of Israel introduced their native language, and thereby contributed to the formation of a dialect, different from the original tongue. When the captivity came to an end, and the Jews were at liberty to return to their own country, some preferred to remain in Babylon, where their families had taken root, but the bulk of the nation, under the leadership of Ezra and Zerubbabel, went back to the land of their fathers. When the ordinances of religion came to be re-established, it was found that a knowledge of the original speech of the people was limited to a few, and that the majority of the returned exiles knew no other language than the Chaldee. That synagogues were in existence at this time is not probable, because one of the first objects to which Ezra directed his attention was the public reading of the five books of Moses, for the instruction of all. In order to enable the audience to understand the meaning, persons were appointed to translate the Hebrew into Chaldee, and explain the sense as the reader proceeded. This was the origin of the office of meturgeman, or interpreter, which, in the course of time, came to be recognized in every synagogue as an established institution. At first it was confined to the more learned and intelligent, who gave their services gratuitously, but when traditional interpretations of Scripture began to be known among the people, by means of the readings at public worship, the function was regarded as less honourable, and ultimately it came to be held in so little estimation that the persons who discharged it received payment for their services. It is supposed that at first there was little more than a free rendering of the Hebrew into Chaldee, and that afterwards an exposition was added, which enabled the interpreter to enlarge upon the passage, both together constituting what is now called a Targum.

The earliest allusion, in any Jewish uninspired writing, to the system of interpreting adopted in the synagogues is found in the Talmudic treatise on the Roll (ch. 4, sec. 10), where certain rules are laid down for the guidance of the reader, in respect to particular passages of Scripture. As the Mishna was redacted by Rabbi Judah about A.D. 190, it follows that the

usage which had begun after the Babylonish captivity had continued up to this period. At first the interpretation was given orally and from memory. It is also supposed that the practice of reading in private written Targums originated about the time of the Syro-Grecian kings, two centuries before the Christian era. The first direct notice of such a paraphrase is found in the Gemara, on the Treatise on the Sabbath, which speaks of a Targum on Job, which had been used by Gamaliel, the grandfather of Judah the Redactor. If any reliance can be placed on this statement, it would show that, about the Christian era, and probably previous to it, the Chaldee interpretation of at least one book of the Old Testament had been committed to writing. As Job was not publicly read in the synagogues, it would further show that such helps were used by private persons to assist them in the study of the Scriptures. At a later period, when traditional interpretations had become somewhat settled, and had acquired a certain degree of authority, written Targums came into general use, of which, however, there is no reason to believe that any have survived. A recent writer thinks that they existed in the times of the Maccabees, but there is no evidence in any ancient Jewish writing to prove that they were used in public before the Christian era.

The value of those now extant must be determined by the time at which they were redacted. If they be regarded as embodying the views of the meaning of Scripture entertained by contemporary Jews, it ought not to be forgotten that these opinions were the growth of a long series of years, and that they were of necessity modifications both of earlier and more recent interpretations. The interpreter being allowed to enlarge upon a passage in the way of exposition, the discursive statements which appear in the later Targums must be taken as having a homiletic character. Narratives foolish and legendary, traditions which have no foundation in Scripture, speculations absurd and improbable, and interpretations wholly at variance with the sacred text, present a curious picture of the public teaching in the synagogues in the latter period of the Jewish national life. In the earlier paraphrases these peculiarities do not appear in so marked a form, and the prevailing tendency is to adhere as closely as possible to the letter of Scripture; but when the teachings of the Rabbis had become perverse, their influence was felt in the public interpretations of Scripture, as they now appear embodied in the more recent Targums. This remarkable fact will, to some extent, account for the hatred of the Jews toward Chris-

tianity, because nothing would be more likely to blind the mind against truth than fables and legends intended to perpetuate the distinctive characteristics both of the nation and its religion.

None of the extant Targums were known to Christian scholars till the tenth or eleventh century. Probably influenced by this fact, Morinus, Ribera, and many others, have thought that they could not have been reduced to writing at so early a period as is commonly supposed. Arguing from the silence of Origen, Epiphanius, and especially of Jerome, they arrived at the conclusion that no written paraphrase could have been in existence before the fifth or sixth century. In respect to the Fathers in general, the absence of all mention of the Targums by them is of little importance, because they were ignorant of Hebrew, and would be little likely to know anything of the Chaldee paraphrases, but the case is different with Jerome. He went specially to the Holy Land to learn the sacred language from the Jewish Rabbis, and to obtain from them all possible knowledge, with a view to the preparation of his commentary. If the Targums had been then in existence, it is not credible that in his search for information, he should not have discovered them, and if he knew of them, that there should be no allusion in any of his writings to such important sources of instruction. If the statements in the Talmud be true, that the Targums were held in high esteem, it is difficult to understand how the Christians who associated with Jews in the East could never have heard anything of them. This difficulty was also felt by Helvicus, Vorstius, and, to some extent, by Allix. No real attempt has been made to meet it, nor can it be said to have been successfully grappled with by any subsequent writer. Walton, Prideaux, and Wolfius have replied that, as Jerome only began to learn Chaldee late in life, as he states in the Preface to his Commentary on Daniel, he was probably unable to understand the Targums, even if aware of their existence; that the Rabbis who aided him in his studies probably concealed from him as much of their national literature as they could; that the bitterness and animosity existing between Jews and Christians in the earlier ages of the Church prevented friendly intercourse, and hindered the Fathers from knowing anything of the Targums; and that, many of the prophecies concerning the Messiah being explained by them in a Christian sense, the former had good reason for concealing them from their opponents, lest they should, by making them known, injure their own cause. It was for these reasons that the Chaldee

paraphrases did not become known to Christians till the tenth century, although they must have been in existence long before. Nevertheless, the silence of Jerome still remains unaccounted for, and the effect of it must be at least to render it doubtful, whether the traditional interpretations of Scripture now extant had in his time been committed to writing.

If no Targums were redacted till the fourth or fifth century, Wolfius asks, what would be the use of committing them to writing, when the Chaldee, like the Hebrew many ages before, having ceased to be a spoken language, would be useless for enabling the bulk of the people to understand the sacred text? The objection is weak, because languages once used in religious worship have a tenacious vitality which it is difficult to destroy. The survival of the Latin in the services of the Church of Rome is a proof of this. At a very late period, and long after the Chaldee had ceased to be spoken, the Targums were printed along with the Hebrew text, although the difficulty of learning both languages must have been equally great. Elias Levita says that, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, the lessons from the Pentateuch were always read in the synagogues, first from the Hebrew, and then from the Chaldee paraphrase. When the Babylonian Talmud was completed, the dialect in which it was written was rapidly changing, and ultimately became extinct, so that the objection of Wolfius is really of little weight.

Christian scholars have differed widely as to the utility of the Targums in interpreting Scripture. Pfefferkorn, in his controversy with Reuchlin about the Talmud, wished to have them destroyed, as being of no value whatever. Others have thought that nothing has been gained by printing them in polyglot Bibles, and this feeling has hitherto been so prevalent, that the study of them has almost entirely been neglected. Whether any advantage can be derived from them to the Christian cause, as against Judaism, has also been questioned. The contending parties are agreed upon the interpretation of many passages which speak of the Messiah, and upon which the Targums put constructions accepted by both, but no argument can be based upon them alone to prove the truth of the Christian religion. Allix, in his work against the Unitarians, has used them largely to support the doctrine of the Trinity, and to show that the Jews had some knowledge of it. Whatever be the value of his researches, any testimony which these may be supposed to furnish in favour of the distinctive doctrines of Christianity must be regarded as at least doubtful. Others have said, with more

justice, that the Targums contain many illustrations of Jewish rites and ceremonies, that they furnish important assistance in arriving at the true meaning of difficult passages, that they contain interpretations which, being undoubtedly correct, serve to show the differences of opinion between ancient and modern Jews, when the latter bring forward other views, that they confirm those taken by Christians of many passages in the Old Testament, and that they furnish valuable evidence of the integrity of the sacred text. There are erroneous interpretations, legendary miracles, and stories which only serve to show the puerility of the Jewish mind, and assertions which seem to have no other foundation than a fertile imagination: but when these follies are left out of the question, there still remains much of great interest and value.

So little is known of the external history of the Targums, that the opinions about them entertained by different scholars are nothing but conjecture. Having no basis of fact to rest upon, they are frequently antagonistic, and furnish little assistance toward arriving at definite knowledge concerning the date of the redaction, and the persons by whom they were compiled. Ignorance of the genius and style of the Chaldee language also renders of little value theories as to the time when they were reduced to writing, based upon the supposed tendency of it to degenerate in successive ages, because no scholar seems to be able to distinguish authoritatively between the Babylonian, Antiochian, and Jerusalem dialects, or to say which of them really predominates in the different Targums. Rejecting as valueless much that has been written on these questions, it follows that whatever definite information is to be obtained must be derived from an examination of the paraphrases themselves.

Three Targums on the Pentateuch are now extant. The first is commonly called the Targum of Onkelos, the second the Targum of Palestine, but more commonly the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, and the third the Targum of Jerusalem. There is historical evidence to warrant the belief that such persons as Onkelos and Jonathan lived about the time of Christ, but the opinion, long entertained, that they wrote the paraphrases called by their names, has been shown to be groundless. It rested upon statements in the Talmud, which are to a considerable extent legendary, and therefore untrustworthy, and which, when carefully examined, have proved to be insufficient for the purpose intended. The Targum of Onkelos furnishes no real internal evidence of the date of its compilation, although some have supposed that there is a

passage which shows that it must have been written before the destruction of the temple. The paraphrase on Gen. xlix. 27, is, 'in his (Benjamin's) land will dwell the Shekinah, and in his possession will the sanctuary be built. In the morning and evening will the priests offer the oblation, and in the evening will they divide the remaining portions of the residue of the sacred things.' There is in these words an undoubted reference to the temple, but it is as reasonable to suppose that this interpretation was preserved by tradition, and committed to writing after the dispersion of the people, as to imagine that it was written while the services were still being carried on. In fact the same paraphrase appears in the Jerusalem Targum, which can be proved to have been redacted at a much later date, and also with greater particularity in that of Palestine, which latter furnishes conclusive internal evidence of its own recent origin. As a matter of conjecture, it has been thought that the Targum of Onkelos was committed to writing in its present form about the end of the third, or beginning of the fourth, century, but there is no satisfactory explanation of the way in which it came to be called by his name. It has been supposed that Aquila in Greek, and Onkelos in Chaldee, are only different forms of the same name. The version of the Old Testament made by the former, being more literal than the Septuagint, was held in high esteem by the Jews who lived in those countries where Greek was the vernacular. When the Rabbis in Babylon, in the beginning of the fourth century, prepared the Chaldee paraphrase on the same principles, they called it a Targum executed after the manner of Aquila or Onkelos, and hence it derived the name by which it has ever since been known. This is the explanation of Deutsch, but it rests on no real basis of fact.

The Jewish Rabbis had four methods of explaining the sacred text, each of which is employed in the Targums. The first was called Peshat, or the simple rendering of words from one language into another; the second, Remez, intimation or suggestion of meaning; the third, Derush, historical, anecdotal or allegorical exposition; and the fourth, Sod, evolving of mystical or esoteric meanings. Derush included also Halaka and Hagada, the former being a rule or law for the guidance of human life, and the latter, legends or fables or historical events employed in the way of illustration. In the Targum of Onkelos, there is close adherence to the original Hebrew, and, for the most part, a literal rendering of terms, so that Peshat is its fundamental principle of interpretation. Hagadistic enlargements, so common in the later Targums, are not

resorted to, except in a few poetical passages, where such a licence seemed to be allowable. Anthropomorphic descriptions of God are explained by metaphors, and whatever might seem to measure the Divine character by a human standard is avoided. These considerations have been taken as amounting to accumulative proof of the antiquity of the Targum, or at least that it is older than any of the others now extant.

That the Targum of Palestine was in existence in the time of S. Paul has been supposed to be proved by his mention of Jannes and Jambres (in 2 Tim. iii. 8), the magicians who opposed Moses at the court of Pharaoh. No such persons are named in the Old Testament, but the paraphrase on Ex. vii. 11, is, 'Pharaoh called the wise men and magicians, and Jannes and Jambres also, magicians of Egypt, did the same with their burnings of divinations.' The Targum on ch. i. 15 says that they were the chief magicians, and that they told Pharaoh that an Israelitish child was about to be born, which should bring about the destruction of Egypt, and that he in consequence gave the midwives orders to kill all the male children. From these passages the inference has been drawn that S. Paul must have derived his information from the Targum, and that it must therefore have been in existence in his time. Wolfius justly answers, that the Apostle either obtained his knowledge by divine revelation, or that he embodied in his epistle a tradition current among the Jews, which he may have often heard in the synagogues in the oral interpretation, from which it found its way into the written Targum, the age of which must be determined by other means.

If Jonathan, by whose name it is otherwise called, really lived at the time of our Lord, there is conclusive internal evidence to show that it must have been compiled several centuries after his time. It must have been written subsequent to the redaction of the Mishna, because in the paraphrase on Ex. xxvi. 9 mention is made of the 'six orders' of it, and in that on Lev. xxiii., where the day of atonement is spoken of, there is a quotation almost verbatim from the treatise in the Talmud on the same subject. This consideration alone removes the Targum at least two centuries from the time of Jonathan. The date of its compilation must have been much later, because in the explanation of Balaam's prophecy (Numb. xxiv. 19) Constantinople and Lombardy are mentioned; but as neither the city nor the province received their names till long after, the date of the Targum must be placed still further back. In the paraphrase on Gen. x. 2 the Turks

are spoken of, in that on ch. xxi. 22 the two wives of Mahomet, Adisha and Fatima, and in that on the miraculous survey by Moses of the promised land in Deut. xxxiv., Anti-christ is designated under the name 'Armillus,' which was an invention of the later Rabbis. The Targum on Ex. vii. 5 describes Pharaoh as 'observing divinations in the water on the bank of the river as a magician;' and that on Gen. iii. 24 speaks of Gehinnom as having been prepared for the wicked two thousand years before the creation of the world. These are legends which have been copied from the Babylonian Gemara, which was not finally completed till the beginning of the sixth century, so that the Targum of Palestine must be assigned to a subsequent date. It has been conjectured that it was compiled in Palestine, from whence it derived its name, and that it was finally completed in its present shape by the Rabbis in Babylon about the latter end of the seventh century; but there is no trustworthy external evidence to determine either of these points.

The same difficulty, as in the case of the Targum of Onkelos, exists as to the way in which it came to be called by the name of Jonathan. It has been suggested that a somewhat similar process was adopted in both cases. As the Greek translation of the Old Testament by Theodotion was only a recension of the Septuagint, and, as this Targum is supposed to have been compiled from older interpretations, which were embodied in it in an emended form, when a name was required to give it authority Jonathan was selected, because he was the most famous of the disciples of Hillel. It was also chosen because it had the same meaning as Theodotion, both signifying 'God-given.' Allix, with whom Prideaux agrees, held that the Targum was really written by Jonathan, although he supposed that it was interpolated by the later Rabbis, who inserted the legends and fables which it now contains.

The version is not literal, like that of Onkelos. It is diffuse, and frequently branches off into disquisitions which have no apparent connexion with the sacred text. There are unaccountable errors of interpretation, as when, on Gen. xxxv. 8, it paraphrases 'the oak of weeping' by 'the other weeping,' as if the compiler supposed that the Hebrew *אֵלֶּךָ* (oak) and the Greek *ἄλλον* (other) had the same meaning. In the fragmentary Jerusalem Targum the expression is correctly rendered. Anthropomorphisms are avoided, legendary stories are numerous, the evil deeds of the Patriarchs are excused or regarded as virtues, and no opportunity is neglected of magnifying them. If the Targum were really compiled

toward the end of the seventh century, and if it be the expression of the opinions of the Jews of that age, it will show conclusively that their moral sentiments had become perverted, that fables and legends were supplanting divine truth, and that the teachings of the Rabbis had become puerile and superstitious.

The Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch, as it now stands, is incomplete, being only a collection of fragments. From the striking resemblance of passages which it contains with expressions employed in the New Testament, the inference has been drawn that it must have been in existence at the Christian era. In Matt. vi. 9 the words are, 'Our Father, which art in heaven,' &c.; and in the paraphrase on Deut. xxxii. 6 they are, 'Is He not your Father which is in heaven, Who bought you?' In Luke vi. 38 it is said, 'With what measure ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again;' and in the Targum on Gen. xxviii. 36 the words are, 'With the measure that a man measureth, shall it be measured to him, whether good measure or evil.' In Rev. v. 10 the saints are said to be made unto God kings and priests; and in the Targum on Ex. xix. 6 the words are, 'And to My Name shall you be kings and priests and a holy people.' In Rev. xx. 6, 14, the second death is mentioned; and in the Targum on Deut. xxiii. 6 it is said, 'Let Reuben live in this world, and not die the second death, which the wicked die in the world to come.' From these coincident expressions, it has been inferred that the Targum must have been reduced to writing before the Christian era, otherwise the very words could not have been quoted. The argument, however, is capable of being answered in one or both of two ways, even if there were no internal evidence of the late origin of the paraphrase. It might be supposed that the compiler was acquainted with the New Testament, and that he borrowed his expressions from it: but the utter detestation in which everything Christian was held by the Jews renders it difficult to believe that they would avail themselves in any way of the aid of the sacred writings. A more likely opinion is, that these forms of speech were in common use in New Testament times, that they continued to be employed long after, and that they were ultimately embodied in the Targum.

It has been conjectured that it was called the Targum of Jerusalem because it was written in the corrupt Jerusalem dialect, in which many foreign terms were embodied, and from hence it has been inferred that it had a late origin. Elias Levita, who lived at the beginning of the sixteenth

century, says that the name of the author was not known, and he conjectured, from the similarity of style, that it was compiled about the same time as the Jerusalem Talmud. The paraphrase on Gen. x. 2, 3, speaks of the Turks, of France (Pharkai, Phrygia?) and Barbary, terms which Morinus shows did not come into common use till six centuries after the Christian era. The legends which it contains, borrowed from the Talmud, as in the case of the Targum of Palestine, are also a conclusive proof that it must have been compiled at some subsequent period. Being fragmentary, and referring only to portions of the Pentateuch, it has been supposed that it is only a collection of glosses upon the other Targums, and that it was never intended to be a complete paraphrase. The style is that of a Midrash, or exposition,¹ rather than that of a version, and the method of interpretation is Derush.

There is reason to believe that the Targums were not originally in the same state in which they now appear. They have been interpolated and mutilated by both Jews and Christians, and by each for a particular purpose. In order to avoid affording even the semblance of support to the Christian doctrine of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, the Targum of Palestine introduces a Hagadistic explanation of the pronoun 'Us' in Gen. i. 26. It represents God as addressing the angels, who are supposed to have been created on the second day, and saying to them, 'Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness,' thus putting them and the Almighty on a certain footing of equality. This is believed to have been an interpolation of the later Jews, who entertained the delusion that God consulted a council of angels before taking action. The passage, however, does not suit the context, which says that, 'in the image of the Lord, He created him.' Nothing like it is found in the Targum of Onkelos; and that of Jerusalem says that 'The Word of the Lord created man in His likeness, and in the likeness of the presence of the Lord created He him.' In the Targum of Jerusalem, on Ex. xxii. 42, the words originally were, 'And King Messiah shall come forth from the midst of Rome, and shall destroy every one that shall be left of the impious city of Rome.' This was the reading of the old copies, and the passage was so quoted by Elias Levita. The latter clause was omitted from subsequent editions published in Italy, in obedience to the mandate of the Papal censors; and it does not now appear in the text. In the edition of the Targums published at Venice in the early part of the

¹ 'Story'—2 Chron. xiii. 22, *marg.* 'commentary.'

sixteenth century, called the little Venetian Codex, there are passages in those of Jerusalem and Palestine which differ widely from the present text. Both paraphrases on Gen. xxxviii. 25 say that when Tamar was brought forth to be burned, she could not find the three pledges, but the earlier edition adds, 'because Sammael, the angel of death, had concealed them from her,' a clause which has since disappeared. The Venetian Targum of Jerusalem, on chap. xlv. 18, attributes to Judah, when addressing Joseph, a much more insolent and audacious speech than that which is now found in it. When he had finished, it represents him as having shouted so loudly, that all Egypt was frightened, that pregnant women miscarried, and that the walls of half the fortified towns fell to the ground. Nothing of this is found in the present text. In the same paraphrase on chap. xlix. 18, the Venetian edition has the words, 'Our father Jacob said as a prophet, I have waited for Thy salvation, O Lord, not for the salvation of Gideon, the son of Joash, which passes away, nor of Samson, the son of Manoah, which is the salvation of an hour, but for the salvation of Messiah, the son of David, who will hereafter liberate the children of Israel, and bring them back from captivity.' The modern copies, instead of the words 'which is for an hour,' read either, 'which is that of a righteous man,' or 'which is a creature of redemption,' and, instead of the clause referring to the Messiah, the Targum of Jerusalem has 'the salvation which Thou hast said in Thy Word will come to Thy people the children of Israel.' The Targum of Palestine contains the legend of the two hundred thousand Ephraimites who set out from Egypt three years before the time appointed for the liberation, and were destroyed at Gath by the Philistines (1 Chron. vii. 21). It says that their bones lay in the plain of Dura (ignoring the geography), till they were restored to life by the ministry of Ezekiel in a later age. The Venetian edition has the statement, which has since disappeared from the text, that Nebuchadnezzar's drinking-cups were made of these bones, and that when the dead men were re-animated, they struck the mouth of the impious king. All were raised except one man, and when the Prophet asked the reason, the reply of God was, that he had been a usurer, and could not be allowed to live again. Nothing of this appears in any of the Targums as they are now printed. The Venetian copy of the Jerusalem Targum on Ex. xiv. 21 contains a legendary account of a violent altercation between Moses and the sea, before it would open its waters to allow the Israelites to pass through, which has disappeared from the later editions. Similar variations

are found in the paraphrases on the other books of Scripture besides the Pentateuch. Wherever the strong animus of the Jews against Rome appears, the passage is invariably altered in the later copies, of which many examples are given by Baxtorf. In the Aruch, a lexicon for the Talmuds of Jerusalem and Babylon and the Chaldee paraphrases, published by Nathan Ben Jeehiel in the beginning of the twelfth century, there are quotations from the latter, which differ widely from the passages now extant, and especially in the places where the meaning of the text is a matter of controversy between Christians and Jews.

The Targums contain interpretations of Scripture which in some cases are at variance with the Hebrew as it is now understood, but, with these exceptions, they agree in general with the views commonly received. The Targum of Onkelos coincides verbally in many places with the sacred text, and so close was the resemblance, that it was read in the synagogues according to the Hebrew accentuation. The Hagadistic amplifications of those of Palestine and Jerusalem require to be swept away before the residuum, which contains the actual interpretation, can be discovered. Occasionally, where there is little amplification, legendary ideas are introduced into the narrative, as when it is said that God made for Adam and Eve vestments from the skin of the serpent, that they were preserved by his descendants till the time of Isaac, and that Rebecca clothed Jacob with them, to enable him to deceive his father. If all such follies be disregarded, the views of the old Jews as to many difficult passages will come out clearly and plainly. The explanation of the protevangelium (Gen. iii. 15) in the T. O. (Targum of Onkelos) shows that the compilers had no adequate conception of its true meaning. 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy son and her son. He (*ipsa*, Vulg.) will remember thee, what thou didst to him at the beginning, and thou shalt watch him in the end.' Of the various readings in the Septuagint one partly agrees with this view. 'He shall watch against thy head, and thou shalt watch against his heel.' The T. P. (Targum of Palestine) gives a different interpretation of the latter clause, but it fails to assign a personal Messianic reference. 'It shall be, when the sons of the woman keep the commandments of the law, they will be prepared to smite thee upon the head, but when they forsake the commandments of the law, thou wilt be prepared to wound them in the heel.' To this the further statement is added, that there will be a remedy for the heel, 'they will make a bruise with the heel,' T. J. (Targum of

Jerusalem) in the days of the King Messiah. That the compilers believed the passage to have a further meaning is evident from the paraphrases of ch. iv. 1. The T. O. is, 'I have acquired the man from before the Lord;' and the T. P., 'I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord,' which latter also makes Abel to have been Cain's twin brother. The former, on v. 4, fails to give the true meaning. 'If thou doest thy work well, is it (sin) not forgiven thee? But if thou doest not thy work well, thy sin is reserved unto the day of judgment, when it will be exacted of thee, if thou be not converted, but if thou be converted, it is forgiven thee.' The T. P. coincides with this to the word 'judgment,' and then adds, 'and at the doors of thy heart lieth thy sin, and into thy hand have I delivered the power over evil passion, and unto thee shall be the inclination thereof, that thou mayest have authority over it, to become righteous or to sin.' The efficacy of repentance in removing the consequences of sin, which is here enforced, is an idea which appears at the end of the Treatise on the Day of Atonement (ch. viii. secs. 8 and 9) in the Mishna, from whence it was probably copied into both Targums. The T. O., on v. 10, is, 'The voice of the blood of the generations which were to come from thy brother complaineth before me from the earth,' with which the T. J. agrees. The T. P. is, 'The voice of the bloods (of the drops of blood?) of the murder of thy brother, which are swallowed up in the sod, cry before me from the earth.' Both these interpretations are found in the Treatise on the Sanhedrim (ch. iv. sec. 5) in the Mishna. The sevenfold vengeance threatened against the man who should kill Cain is explained in the T. P. to mean, that he and his posterity should be punished to the seventh generation. According to the same Targum, the sign given to Cain was the name of God written upon his face, which was to be his sure protection from danger. The T. O., on the last clause of v. 26, is, 'in his days the sons of men desisted from praying in the name of the Lord;' and the T. P. is, 'That was the generation, in the time of which they began to err, and to make themselves idols, and called them by the name of the Word of the Lord.' The three Targums, on Gen. xiv. 18, agree in representing Melchizedech as bringing forth bread and wine, and the T. P. and the T. J. add that he was Shem, the son of Noah. The T. O., on Gen. xxii. 14, fails to give the correct meaning of the text. 'And Abraham worshipped and prayed in that place, and said before the Lord, Here shall generations worship, wherefore it shall be

said in that day, "In this mountain Abraham worshipped before the Lord" (bound Isaac his son, and there the Shekinah of the Lord was revealed to him, T. P.). The difficult passage in Gen. xxxvi. 24 is explained in the T. O. to mean, 'He is Ana, who found the giants (mules, T. P.) in the desert, while he tended the asses of his father Zibeon.' The Septuagint does not attempt a translation, merely reproducing the Hebrew term *אנא*, as if it were pronounced in Greek 'Jamim.' The former part of the T. O., on Gen. xlix. 11, 12, is neither a translation nor a paraphrase of the text as it now appears in Hebrew Bibles. 'Israel shall pass round about in his (the Messiah's) cities, the people shall build his temple; they will be righteous round about him, and be doers of the law through his doctrine. Of goodly purple will be his raiment, and his vesture of crimson dyed bright with colours. His mountains (eyes, E. V.) shall be red with his vineyards, and his hills drop with wine, his valleys (teeth, E. V.) shall be white with corn, and with flocks of sheep.' The T. P. and T. J. understand the former part of the passage as a metaphorical description of the warlike acts of the Messiah, who shall slay kings, and reddens the mountains with the blood of his enemies. They take the latter clause as a prophecy of the equity of his rule, and of the prosperity and happiness which the people shall enjoy under his beneficent government.

The T. O., on Ex. iii. 14, does not translate the Divine Name, but simply gives the Hebrew words, 'Eheyeh Asher Eheyeh' (I am He who is and who will be, T. P. Eheyeh has sent me unto you, T. J.). The explanation which it gives of Ex. vi. 3 is, 'I appeared unto Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, by the name of El Shaddai, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them;' (but my name Yeha, as it discovereth my glory, was not known to them, T. P. But the name of the Word of the Lord was not known to them, T. J.) It interprets Ex. xxi. 24, 25, literally, the version being identical with the original; but in the T. P. the Pharisaic tendency to explain away or mitigate the rigour of the law manifests itself. 'The value of an eye for an eye, the value of a tooth for a tooth, the value of a hand for a hand, the value of a foot for a foot, an equivalent of the pain of burning for burning, and of wounding for wounding, and of blow for blow.' This shows that, at the period when the Targum was compiled, a pecuniary fine might be inflicted in place of the application of the *Lex talionis*. The explanation of the vision of the elders in Ex. xxiv. 10, 11, given by the T. O. is, 'and they saw the glory of

the God of Israel, and under the throne of his glory, as the work of a precious stone, and as the face of heaven for its clearness. Yet the princes of the sons of Israel were not hurt, and they saw the glory of the Lord, and rejoiced in their sacrifices, which were accepted with favour, as though they had eaten and drunk' ('Upon Nadab and Abihu, the comely young men, was the stroke not sent in that hour, but it awaited them on the eighth day for a retribution to destroy them, but they saw the glory of the Shekinah of the Lord, and rejoiced that their oblations were received with favour, and so did eat and drink,' T. P.). The views taken by the Targums of the heave and wave offerings differ from the ideas which these terms commonly convey. They regard the latter as those which were waved or lifted up by the priest, and the former as those parts which were separated for this purpose from the rest of the sacrifice, in this explanation agreeing in the main with the Septuagint. The T. O., with which the T. P. agrees, on Ex. xxix. 24, 26, 27, is, 'Put thou all upon the hands of Aaron and upon the hands of his sons, and uplift them for an elevation before the Lord (separate them for a separation, Septuagint, wave them for a wave offering, E. V.) . . . and thou shalt take the breast of the ram of Aaron's oblation, and uplift it, an elevation before the Lord (separate it as a separate offering, S., wave it for a wave offering, E. V.), and it shall be thy portion, and thou shalt consecrate the breast of the elevation (the separated breast, S., the breast of the wave offering, E. V.), and the shoulder of separation (which has been separated, S., the heave offering, E. V.), which is uplifted (separated, S., heaved E. V.), and which is separated (removed, S. heaved up, E. V.), of the oblation ram of Aaron and his sons.' The same interpretation also appears in both Targums on Numb. xxiii. 8. 'And the Lord said to Aaron, behold I have given to thee the charge of my separated things (the first fruits, S., mine heave offerings, E. V.), of all that are consecrated by the sons of Israel, unto thee have I given them . . .' And on v. 8, 'the separated things of their meat offerings (first fruits of their gifts, S., heave offering of their gift, E. V.), of all the elevations (*ἐπιθεμάτων*, wave offerings, S. & E. V.) of the sons of Israel, to thee have I given them.' Between the Targums and the E. V. there is no real difference, if the wave and heave offerings be understood in their real and not in their popular sense. Ceremonial waving of portions of the sacrifices by the priests consisted in moving them upward and downward, backward and forward, the former being the predominant

idea in the mind of the Targumists, but not laterally, so that it is an error to suppose that the oblation was waved toward the four points of the compass, as an acknowledgment of the universal government of God. Heaving did not consist in uplifting ceremonially, but in removing a portion of the sacrifices which then became a separation, ἀφαίρεμα, set apart as holy and devoted to God.

The T. P. expounds the blessing of the people in Numb. vi. 24-26 in the following terms: 'The Lord bless thee in all thy business, and keep thee from demons of the night, and things that cause terror, and from demons of the noon (Ps. xci. 6, the evil spirit at noon day, S.), and of the morning, and from malignant spirits and phantoms. The Lord make his face to shine upon thee, when occupied in the law, and reveal to thee its secrets, and be merciful unto thee. The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee in thy prayer, and grant thee peace in thy end.' The blessing was given, both in the temple and in the synagogues, in pure Hebrew, which is retained in the Targums, and in doing so, the name of God was always in the former uttered according to its true pronunciation, but in the latter by its substitute, Adonai. (Treatise on the Daily Sacrifice, ch. vii. sec. 2.) When it was spoken by the High Priest on the day of atonement, all the people fell prostrate on the ground in token of their reverence and awe. This feeling finds expression in the T. P. on Deut. xxxii., where it is said that Moses would not pronounce the Holy Name till he had dedicated his mouth by previously uttering twenty-one words (vv. 1 and 2, Heb.), which make up eighty-six letters.¹ According to the same authority, even the highest angels in heaven cannot utter it till they have repeated the Trisagion. Owing to this superstition, the Tetragrammaton ceased to be pronounced in common life, and its true vocalization cannot now be determined with any degree of certainty. Rabbi Trypho has left it on record, that, before the destruction of the Temple, he went into the court of the priests, and listened with bated breath and rapt attention to catch the sound, when the blessing was given from the steps of the porch after the burning of the incense on the golden altar, but the words were drowned by the music of the Levitical choir, which burst immediately forth, so that he was unable to learn the correct pronunciation.

The Targums regard the release from debts in the Sab-

¹ The present Hebrew text has only nineteen words and eighty-one letters.

batical year as absolute, which is also the view taken by the Septuagint. The true interpretation, that the right of demanding payment was restricted only during the time that the land lay fallow, and that it revived immediately after, does not appear to have been known to the compilers. The T. O. seems to include all debts owing from one Israelite to another, but the T. P. distinctly limits those which could not be demanded, to money lent on loan.

Throughout the Targums on the Pentateuch, the term *Memra* (word) is used in numerous passages, but there is a difference of opinion as to its true meaning. Some think that it corresponds with the *λόγος* as used by S. John, and that the former was the occasion of the latter being employed. This, however, is impossible, because, from whatever source the Evangelist derived the expression, it is clear that it could not have been from the extant Targums, which were not in existence in his day. Those who take this view say that the *Memra* is the Second Person in the ever-blessed Trinity, distinct from the Father, but 'of one substance,' and that it is a designation of the Messiah. Another opinion is, that the term is only a method of speech peculiar to the Chaldee language, corresponding in meaning to *nephesh* in the Hebrew, and *gn'tsem* as used by the Rabbis, and that it has a reciprocal signification, which could not be expressed by a simple pronoun. Vorstius, in his reply to Rittangelius, held that it was always to be understood in the sense of a property, or attribute, or action, of God, and that it ought not to be taken as conveying the idea of a person. Prideaux, Wolfius and others took up the ground that, being, like *λόγος* in the New Testament, *πολύσημον*, or susceptible of different interpretations, no argument in support of the Deity of the Messiah ought to be based upon it, unless distinctly indicated by the context, and that it could not be supposed to mean, in every instance, a distinct personality. Rittangelius maintained that in the Targums *Yeya*, the contracted form of *Jehovah*, *Memra* and *Shekinah* were descriptive of three different modes of the Divine existence, in other words, of three Persons, the first meaning the Father, the second the Son, and the third the Holy Spirit. His quotations from the Targums do not always support his views; but there is sufficient evidence to show that the compilers had in their minds a conception, however inadequate, of the distinction to be drawn between the Persons in the Godhead. As this appears more prominently in the T. P. and T. J. than in the T. O., it is not improbable that, notwithstanding their antipathy to the Christian

religion, some part of their knowledge may have been derived from it.

Between the Hebrew and the T. O. there is a close correspondence in the use of the terms Jehovah and Yeya in many places, which supports the opinion, that each describes one of the modes of existence of the Divine Being, different from the Memra and the Shekinah. In the following passages the Targum always renders the one term by the other:—

‘And the Lord was revealed to him in the plain (under the oak, Heb.) of Mamre, as he sat in the door of the tent while the day was hot’ (Gen. xviii. 1).

‘And the Lord said to Moses . . . be ready for the third day. The Lord will be revealed in the eyes of all the people on Mount Sinai’ (Ex. xix. 11).

‘And the Lord was revealed on Mount Sinai on the top of the mountain; and the Lord called Moses to the top of the mountain’ (*Ib.* v. 20).

‘I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage’ (Ex. xx. 2).

‘And the Lord was revealed in the cloud, and spake with him’ (Numb. xi. 25).

The assertion of Rittangelius, that the *Memra* always denotes a mode of the Divine existence, is not to be received without qualification. It must also not be taken as having the same meaning as *pithgama*, which corresponds to *ῥῆμα* in Greek, and means speech or discourse in the ordinary sense, being used as well, in some cases, to express the words of God. This distinction appears in Gen. xv. :—

‘After these things the Word (*Pithgama*) of the Lord came to Abram in prophecy, saying, Fear not, Abram, my Word (*Memra*) shall be thy strength, and thy exceeding great reward; . . . and so the Word (*Pithgama*) of the Lord was with him, saying, This shall not be thy heir, but a son whom thou shalt beget shall be thy heir; . . . and he believed in the word of the Lord (*Memra da Yeya*), and He reckoned it to him unto justification.’

The proper sense of *Memra* must be determined by the context. In some cases it is employed to express the Divine energy in action, in others the volitions of the Deity, and in others it may be taken to mean the dispensations of Providence. After omitting all such passages, there still remain many, which can only be understood as conveying the idea of a distinct Personality in the Godhead. Each Targum furnishes abundant proof of this statement. ‘And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, If the Word of the Lord will be with me, and will keep me in the

way in which I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to wear, and bring me again in peace to my father's house, the Word of the Lord shall be my God' (Gen. xxviii. 20, 21). In chap. xxxi. 13 the angel of the Lord said to him, 'I am the God of Bethel, . . . where thou vowedst a vow unto me;' so that, by comparing the passages together, it will appear that the Targumist regarded the Word as a Person, and that Person as Divine. 'And Moses led forth the people out of the camp to meet the Word of the Lord' (Ex. xix. 17), where also the term must be taken as having a Personal meaning. 'These are the statutes and judgments and laws which the Lord appointed between His Word and the sons of Israel on Mount Sinai, by the hand of Moses' (Lev. xxvi. 46). 'I have seen that in the house of Jacob the worshippers of idols are not; nor in Israel the workers of the works of lies. The Word of the Lord their God is their keeper, and the Shekinah of their king is among them' (Numb. xxiii. 21). In this passage the terms *Yeya*, *Memra* and *Shekinah* are used in the Targum, and it is evident that they must be distinguished from each other. Personal subsistence is also attributed to the *Memra* in passages in Deuteronomy. 'The Word of the Lord who leadeth before you will fight for you, according to all that He did for you in Egypt in your sight, and in the wilderness, where thou hast seen that the Lord thy God carrieth thee' (chap. i. 30). 'These forty years the Word of the Lord thy God hath been thy helper, so that thou hast not wanted anything' (chap. ii. 7). 'I stood between the Word (*Memra*) of the Lord and you, to announce to you at that time the word (*Pithgama*) of the Lord' (chap. v. 5). 'When thou goest out to war with thy adversaries, and seest horses and chariots and more people than thou, be not afraid of them, for thy helper is the Word of the Lord thy God, who brought thee up from the land of Egypt' (chap. xx. 1).

These passages are from the Targum of Onkelos, and those of Palestine and Jerusalem furnish others to the same purport. 'And the Word of the Lord called to Adam, and said to him, Behold the world which I have created is manifest before Me . . . and how thinkest thou that the place in which thou art is not revealed before Me?' (Gen. iii. 9, T. J.) 'And the Word of the Lord said, Behold Adam, whom I have created, is sole (*yechidai*, unigenitus, only begotten) in thy world, as I am sole in the heavens above' (*ib.* v. 23, T. J.) 'And the Word of the Lord . . . turned, and caused to descend upon them bitumen and fire, from before the Lord, from heaven' (ch. xix. 24, T. J.). The same form of expression in reference to the

destruction of Sodom, occurs in the T. P. on Deut. xxix. : 'Ruined, as Sodom and Gomorrah, Admai and Zeboim, were overthrown by the Word of the Lord in His wrath and indignation.' 'And the Lord revealed Himself to Jacob again on his return from Padan Aram, and the Lord blessed him by the name of His Word' (Gen. xxxv. 9, T. P.) 'The Word of the Lord sitteth upon His throne, high and lifted up, and heareth our prayer at what time we pray before Him, and make our petitions' (Deut. iv. 7, T. P.) 'When the Word of the Lord shall reveal Himself to redeem His people, He will say to all the nations, "Behold now, that I am He who am, and was, and will be, and there is no other God beside me"' (ch. xxxii. 39, T. P.) 'No prophet hath arisen yet in Israel whom the Word of the Lord knew in all the miracles . . . which the Word of the Lord sent him to perform' (ch. xxxiv. 10, 11, T. P.) These quotations, and many others which might be produced, seem to prove that the Targumists regarded the *Memra* as a Person distinct from *Yeya*, because they attribute to Him personal acts, and also that they regarded His nature as Divine.

The third method of the Divine subsistence can be shown with some degree of clearness by passages in which the *Shekinah* is distinguished from *Yeya*, and in some cases from the *Memra*; and if this point can be established, it will follow that the later Jews believed in a Trinity, although their notion of it must have been of necessity indistinct. 'God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall make his *Shekinah* to dwell in the tabernacles of Shem' (Gen. ix. 27). 'And the Lord said to Moses, Say to the children of Israel . . . If for one hour I should make my *Shekinah* to go up from among thee, I should destroy thee' (Ex. xxiii. 5). At the end of ch. xxxiii. the three Divine Persons seem to be distinguished from each other. 'And he said, Thou canst not see the face of my *Shekinah*, for no one can see and remain alive. And the Lord said, Behold there is a place prepared before Me, and it shall be when my *Shekinah* passeth, that I will put thee in a cavern of the rock, and my Word shall overshadow thee, until I have passed, and I will take away the word (*Dibberath*) of my *Shekinah*, and thou shalt see what is after Me, but my face shall not be seen' (vv. 20, 23). They are also clearly distinguished in the T. O. on Numb. xi. 20: 'And the Lord said to Moses, say thou to the people . . . Because you have rejected the Word of the Lord, whose *Shekinah* dwelleth upon you, and before Whom you have wept . . .' Personal action is attributed by the T. J. on Deut. xxxii. 10 to the *Shekinah*: 'His

Shekinah taught them the ten words (commandments), watched over them, and kept them as the apple of His eye.'

Rittangelius understands by the *Shekinah* in each of these passages a Divine Person, which is the view taken in many places in the Talmud, but even if it be understood in a general sense, as only the visible manifestation of the Deity, it must be regarded as an Existence distinct from *Yeya* and the *Memra*. Whether the *Shekinah* be the same as the latter, or a distinct Personality, is a question on which there is a difference of opinion. Those who hold the former view refer to the T. P. on Numb. xxi. 5, where it is said that the people imagined in their hearts, and spake against the Word (*Memra*) of the Lord, and contended with Moses; but at v. 7 they confess, 'We have sinned, because we imagined and spake against the glory of the *Shekinah* of the Lord and contended against thee.' The T. O. on Deut. xxxiii. 36, 37, seems to distinguish the three Persons. 'There is no God like the God of Israel, whose *Shekinah* in the skies is thy help, and whose power is in the heaven of heavens. The habitation of Elohah is from eternity, and the world was made by his Word.' On the other hand, the distinction observed at the end of Ex. xxxiii. seems to support the latter view, which has been adopted by Elias Levita in his *Shemoth Debarim*, and by many others.

There is no place in the T. O., where the third Person in the Trinity is ever spoken of as the Holy Spirit, but in the T. P. and T. J. He is distinctly mentioned. In the T. O. on Gen. i. 1 it is said: 'In the first times, the Lord created the heavens and the earth . . . and a wind from before the Lord blew upon the face of the waters.' In the T. P. and T. J. the paraphrase is: 'In (or by) wisdom, the Lord created the heavens and the earth, and the Spirit of mercies from before the Lord breathed upon the face of the waters.' If by 'wisdom' in the T. J. be understood the *Memra* (v. 27), it will follow that the Targumist drew a distinction between the Word and the Spirit of God. It also appears in the T. P. on ch. vi. 3: 'And the Lord said by His Word (and the Word of the Lord said, T. J.) . . . Have I not imparted my Holy Spirit to them (or placed my Holy Spirit in them), that they may work good works, and behold their works are wicked?' In this passage the distinction between the Lord, the Word, and the Spirit, is clear. With singular disregard of propriety the T. P. on Gen. xxvii. 5 says that Rebecca heard by the Holy Spirit, when Isaac spoke to his son Esau, and on v. 42 it adds, that the Holy Spirit made known to her Esau's

intention to kill Jacob. After the birth of Joseph, Jacob is represented in the T. P. as saying by the Holy Spirit concerning his posterity: 'They are to be as a flame to consume the house of Esau' (ch. xxx. 25). When the blood-stained garment was brought to him, the same paraphrase makes him say: 'I see by the Holy Spirit (the Spirit of the Sanctuary, T. J.) that an evil woman standeth against him' (ch. xxxvii. 34). The T. J. on Ex. ii. 12, is: 'And Moses by the Holy Spirit (?) considering both the young men, saw that no proselyte could ever spring from that Egyptian, and killed him, and hid him in the sand.' The T. P. on Numb. vii. 89 says: 'And when Moses went into the tabernacle of ordinance to speak with Him, he heard the voice of the Spirit who spake with him, descending from the heaven of heavens upon the mercy seat.' In the same Targum on Deut. xxviii. 58, 59, the distinction between the Persons in the Trinity appears. 'If you observe not to perform all the commandments in the law written in this book, to reverence the glorious and fearful name of the Lord your God, the Word of the Lord will hide the Holy Spirit from you, when the plagues come upon you and your children.'

In the Targums on the Pentateuch, the *Memra* and the Messiah are never identified, from which it is evident that the compilers had a very inadequate notion of His true character. On the contrary, they are distinguished from each other in the T. J. on Ex. xii. 42: 'Moses will come forth from the midst of the desert, and King Messiah from the midst of Rome. The cloud preceded the one, and will go before the other, and the Word of the Lord will ride between them both, and they shall proceed together.' Owing to the state of the text, there is some difficulty in ascertaining the exact meaning of the first clause of the second sentence in the original; but of the third the sense is, that Moses, the Word, and the Messiah, being three distinct persons, will appear at the end of the world to put an end to wickedness and oppression. The same distinction appears in the T. P. on Deut. xxx. 4, 'though you may be dispersed unto the ends of the heavens, from thence will the Word of the Lord gather you by the hand of Elijah the great priest, and from thence will he bring you by the hand of the King Messiah.'

In the T. O. only two passages are explained as prophecies of the Messiah. The paraphrase on Gen. xlix. 10, 11, is, 'He who exercises dominion shall not pass away from the house of Judah, nor the scribe from his children's children for ever, until the Messiah come, whose is the kingdom, and unto

whom shall be the obedience of the nations.' The T. P. and the T. J. give substantially the same interpretation. The paraphrase on Numb. xxiv. 17 is, 'I see Him, but not now; I behold Him, but not nigh. When a King shall arise out of Jacob, and the Messiah be anointed from Israel, He will slay the princes of Moab, and rule over all the children of men' (and bring to nothing all the children of Sheth, T. P., and consume all the children of the East, T. J.) The T. P. on v. 20 represents the destruction of Amalek as being eternal, and as taking place in the days of the Messiah.

In the T. P. and the T. J. the references are more numerous, but they are to be regarded rather as allusions to the Messiah, than as direct interpretations. The former on Gen. xxxv. 21 says, 'And Jacob proceeded and spread his tent beyond the tower of Eder, the place from whence it is to be, that King Messiah is to be revealed in the end of the days;' but the other Targums contain no such reference. The term 'revealed' has been said to be the only expression in the Pentateuch which can be construed as implying the pre-existence of the Messiah, but the T. P. on Ex. xii. 42 seems also to refer to it. 'Four nights are written in the book of memoirs before the Lord. The first when He was revealed in creating the world, the second when He was revealed to Abraham, the third when He was revealed in Egypt, and the fourth when He will be revealed to liberate the people from among the nations.' If the last revelation be considered as meaning the appearance of the Messiah, it will show that the Jews had some conception of His Divine nature. The T. P. on Ex. xl. contains the earliest notice of the fiction of a twofold Messiah, one being the descendant of David, and the other of Ephraim, and in the later Targums it frequently appears (Song of Sol. iv. 5, and vii. 3). To the former were attributed the glory and the power, and to the latter the sufferings, spoken of in prophecy. Messiah, the son of Ephraim, after subduing Gog, is to be slain by Armillus, who in his turn will be destroyed by Messiah, the son of David, who will himself die, after a long reign, upon the duration of which the Rabbis are not agreed, and will leave his kingdom to his son. He who is to subdue Gog is spoken of in the T. J. on Numb. xi. 26. Eldad and Medad at first prophesied separately, but afterwards they said conjointly, 'At the end of the days will Gog and Magog and his host come up against Jerusalem, but by the hand of King Messiah they will fall, and seven years of days will the children of Israel kindle their fire with their weapons of war, not going into the wilderness, nor cutting'

down trees' (Ezek. xxxix. 8, 9). The T. P. introduces a Messianic reference on the paraphrase on Numb. xxiii. 21, 'the Word of the Lord their God is their help, and the trumpets of King Messiah resound among them' (and the trumpet of their glorious King protects them, T. J.)

The angelology of the later Rabbis appears in the T. P. and the T. J., but in the corresponding passages in T. O. there is no allusion to it whatever. This development would of itself show that the former were compiled at a much later period. Scripture is silent about the creation of angels, but the T. P. says that they were brought into existence on the second day. Sammael, the angel of death, appeared to Eve, and terrified her immediately before she took of the fruit of the forbidden tree, although the vision did not prevent the transgression. Like Elijah in later times, Enoch was regarded by the Targumists as an angel, because they say, after describing his ascension, that he was called Metatron, the great scribe or teacher (*Saphra*). The angels who had been cast out of heaven were Schamchazzai and Uzziel, who in the period before the flood, when wickedness was superabounding, walked upon the earth, and associated with the daughters of man. The T. P. calls them sons of the great, but the T. O. simply says that they were giants. To Moses, when keeping the flock of Jethro in Midian, Zagnugael appeared in the flaming fire in the bush: but in the immediate context, it is said that the Lord called to him, and proclaimed Himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. When the lawgiver died, Michael and Gabriel prepared a golden bier, set with precious stones, and adorned with hangings of different colours. Metatron, Jophiel, Uriel, and Jephephya having laid him upon it, he was carried a distance of four miles, and buried in the valley opposite Beth Peor. Before the flood, all the living creatures which were to be preserved were conveyed into the ark by an angel. Before the dispersion at the tower of Babel, God said to the seventy angels who stood before Him, 'let Us descend and confound their language, that no man may be able to understand the speech of his neighbour.' This fiction was invented, as in the case of the creation of man, to neutralize any support which the sacred text might be supposed to afford to the Christian doctrine of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead. According to the views of the Rabbis, there were from henceforth on the earth seventy nations, over each of which an angel was now appointed, with as many different languages and methods of writing. Of this the T. O. knows nothing, but in the

T. P. on Deut. xxxii. it is said that the nations were seventy, because this was the number of the souls which went down with Jacob into Egypt, that they were assigned to the angels by lot, and that when the holy people fell to the Lord of the World, Michael and Gabriel testified their joy at the good fortune of Israel by singing hymns of praise. When Abraham was sitting in the plain of Mamre, three angels appeared to him in the likeness of men. The T. J. calls it the valley of vision, and says that three came to fulfil each a separate function, because it was not possible for a single angel to be charged with more than one mission at a time. The first came to announce to Abraham the birth of Isaac, the second to deliver Lot from the impending overthrow, and the third to destroy Sodom and the cities of the plain. There is a confusion of ideas in the T. P. on Gen. xviii., which may be the result either of interpolation, or of the paraphrase having been compiled by different and unskilful hands. It represents Abraham as saying, 'I beseech thee, O Lord, that the glory of thy *Shekinah* may not now ascend from thy servant, till I have set forth provisions under the tree, and I will bring food, that you may strengthen your heart, and give thanks in the name of the Word of the Lord, and afterwards pass on.' Whatever be the meaning, it is clear that in this passage the Targumist drew a distinction between the Lord, the *Shekinah*, and the Word. In the rest of the narrative, the men are regarded as angels, and distinguished from the Divine Persons. After the message had been delivered, one returned to heaven, and the other two, accompanied by the patriarch, went towards Sodom. Immediately after this statement, the Targum adds, 'and the Lord said with his Word, I cannot hide from Abraham that which I am about to do.' The intercession on behalf of the doomed cities is represented as being made to the Lord Himself, and when it came to an end, it is said that the majesty of the Lord went up. After God had ceased to speak with the patriarch, the two angels came in the evening to Sodom, and executed their mission in the destruction of the city, but they were not allowed to return immediately to heaven, because they had divulged the secrets of the Lord of the world. Wandering through the earth until the time that Jacob left his father's house, they took him under their protection, and accompanied him till he arrived at Bethel. They then went up to heaven, and announced to the other angels, that if they descended to the earth, the patriarch might be seen, this being the Rabbinic method of explaining Jacob's

vision of the ladder. When Abraham on Mount Moriah was on the point of taking the knife into his hand to slay his son, Isaac looked up to the angels, who were saying, 'Come see how these solitary (righteous, T. J.) ones that are in the world kill each other. He who slays delays not, and he who is to be slain reacheth forth his neck.' After the ram, which had been specially created in the evening of the sixth day, had been offered by Abraham, the angels took Isaac, and brought him to the school which had been established by Shem, where he remained three years. It was when he was coming from it, and going to the field to meditate at eventide, that he saw Rebecca approaching with Eliezer. The T. P. on Gen. xxvii. 1 accounts for the dimness of his eyes by saying that, when he had been bound by his father on the altar, he saw the throne of glory, and that from henceforward his powers of vision began to decline. It states on v. 25 that Jacob had no wine, and that in the emergency, an angel prepared it for him to give to his father, from juice which had been kept in the grapes from the beginning of the world. In the same Targum the paraphrase of Gen. xxxi. 24 is 'and there came an angel with a word from before the Lord, and he drew the sword against Laban the deceitful, in a dream of the night,' showing the animus of the Targumist. But in the T. O. the effort is rather to avoid the anthropomorphism: 'And a word came from before the Lord to Laban the Aramite in a dream of the night.' The T. P. on Gen. xxxii. 24 says that it was an angel in the likeness of a man who contended with Jacob, who is shortly after called Michael; and in verse 26 he is represented as saying 'Let me go, for the column of the morning ascendeth, and the hour cometh when the angels on high offer praise to the Lord of the world, and I am one of the angels of praise, but from the day the world was created my time to praise has not come until now.' According to the same Targum, the place was called Peniel, because Jacob had there seen the angels of the Lord face to face. It was Michael who, at the commandment of God, descended from heaven, and enabled Tamar to find the tokens which she had lost (Gen. xxxviii. 25), and who told Moses that Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, with seventy of the elders of Israel, should approach the mountain, and worship at a distance (Gen. xxiv. 1). The T. P. on verse 10, says that the sapphire stone, which they saw in heaven under the throne of glory, had been formed by Gabriel from the clay of which the children of Israel made bricks in Egypt, and that it was intended to be a memorial of their servitude. The same Targum on Gen. xxxvii. 15

says that it was Gabriel in the likeness of a man who found Joseph wandering in the field, and who, as the two were going together to Dothan, told him that he had learned beyond the veil that the servitude to the Egyptians was to begin from that day, and that the Hivites would oppose Israel. It was not the Lord who met Moses in the inn and sought to kill him (Ex. iv. 24), but the angel of the Lord, according to the T. P., which calls him the destroyer, and the angel of death. In the night of the exodus, ninety thousand myriads of destroying angels passed through the land of Egypt, accompanying the Word of the Lord as He smote the firstborn (Ex. xii. 12). The T. P. on Ex. xxvii. 28, says that the middle bar was formed from the tree which Abraham planted at Beersheba. When Israel had passed through the Red Sea, the angels cut it down and cast it into the waters, where it floated till another came and proclaimed that the wood was to be used for making the bar, which should be seventy cubits in length, and that it would possess wonderful qualities. When the tabernacle was erected, it would go round the other boards like a serpent; but when the structure was taken down, it would assume its original shape, and become straight as a rod. To the request of Moses that God would show him His glory, according to the T. P. and T. J., the answer was, that He would cause the hosts of the angels who ministered before Him to pass by, and would show him the place of the oracle (Ex. xxxiii. 23). The T. P. on Deut. ix. 19 says that after Israel had fallen into the sin of worshipping the golden calf, five destroying angels, Wrath, Burning, Relentlessness, Destruction, and Indignation, were let loose against them, but that Moses interposed, and called for mercy from God. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob also rose in their graves, and prayed on behalf of the people. Three of the destroyers were forthwith restrained, but two remained. Moses having made further supplication, they also were prevented from inflicting injury; whereupon the lawgiver digged a grave in the land of Moab and buried them. Satan is mentioned in connexion with this event, the T. P. on Ex. xxxii. 1 saying that it was he who caused the people to err, and perverted their hearts during the absence of Moses on the mount.

Although the symbolism of the Targums is fantastic and groundless, it shows that the Jews regarded their ritual as having an inner meaning, in addition to the outward and literal. As they were not compiled till long after the destruction of the Temple, the views they embody must be regarded as having been propounded in the synagogues, when-

ever, in the course of the services, the passages referring to them came to be read, and must in consequence be taken as traditional interpretations. The symbolical meanings assigned are limited to the T. P. and T. J., the T. O. not referring to them in any way. The furniture of the tabernacle, the altar of burnt offering, and the utensils required for divine service, were symbolical, according to the T. P. on Ex. xl. The table of shew-bread was placed on the north side of the holy place, because that was the quarter from whence riches came, and from whence fell the latter rain, which fructified the crops for the sustenance of man. The two piles, each containing six loaves, represented the twelve tribes: but this differs from the opinion of Josephus, who said that they symbolized the twelve signs of the Zodiac. The golden candlestick was placed on the south side, because in that region are the paths of the sun and moon and heavenly bodies, and because from thence come the treasures of wisdom, which resembles light. The seven lamps corresponded to the seven stars, which symbolize the just, who shine for ever in their righteousness (Prov. iv. 18). The golden altar was placed in front of the ark of the testimony, because the wise, who are diligent students of the law, are encircled by a perfume fragrant as the sweet incense. The veil hung at the entrance to the tabernacle symbolized the righteous, who by their merits protected the house of Israel. The altar of burnt offering was placed in front of it, to show that the rich, who spread a table before their doors and feed the poor, would have their sins forgiven, whenever they brought sacrifices to be offered. The water in the laver symbolized the putting away of the sins of those who repented and were converted, and who, when the change took place, poured off their perversity like a flowing stream. The court around the tabernacle was a figure of the merit of the fathers of the world, which encompassed the house of Israel on every side. The hanging at the gate of it symbolized the righteousness of the mothers of mankind, which was spread before the entrance to Gehinnom, that none of the souls of the chosen people might enter there. The tabernacle, and all that it contained, were anointed with the consecrated oil, to symbolize the sovereignty of the house of Judah, and of the Messiah, who is to redeem Israel in the latter days; the allusion being to the unction of kings. The anointing of the altar and the sacred vessels was symbolical of the priesthood of Aaron and his sons, and of the great priest Elijah, who will appear at the close of the captivity. The unction of the laver was a symbol of the office of Joshua,

who was to divide the land, and of Messiah, the son of Ephraim, his descendant, under whose leadership Israel shall vanquish Gog and his confederates.

The sacrifices offered at the consecration of Aaron, both by himself and by the people, had also a symbolical meaning. The calf was appointed for his sin offering, that Satan might not be able to bring against him the accusation of having made the golden calf at Horeb; and the ram for the burnt offering was intended to be a memorial of the righteousness of Isaac, whom his father bound as a sacrifice on Mount Moriah. The sin offering for the people was a kid of the goats, because of its resemblance to Satan (Azazel), that he might be prevented from renewing the charge against the sons of Jacob, that they killed the animal, in order to obtain the means of deceiving their father (Gen. xxvii. 31). The lamb of the first year, which the people were to offer, was to be for them a symbol of the merit of Isaac, when he was bound like a lamb in order to be sacrificed.

The sin offerings mentioned in Lev. xxii. 27 were regarded in the same light. The T. J. says that the bullock to be sacrificed was intended to call to remembrance 'the elder of the east, sincere altogether, who provided a calf tender and good,' for the refreshment of the angels who came to announce the birth of Isaac. The lamb, as before, was a memorial of Isaac, and the kid of the goats was intended to be a reminder of the righteousness of Jacob, the perfect one (?), who having put the skins upon his hands and neck, brought the savoury meat to his father, and was accounted worthy to receive the blessing.

The offerings of the princes at the anointing of the altar (Numb. vii.) were likewise symbolical. The twelve silver bowls represented the twelve tribes, the twelve silver vases the twelve princes, and the twelve golden pans the twelve signs of the Zodiac. Each silver bowl weighed one hundred and thirty shekels, answering to the age of Jochebed, when she gave birth to Moses, and each vase seventy, corresponding to the number of the members of the great Sanhedrim. The twelve golden pans for the incense were symbols of the princes of the twelve tribes, and the weight of each was ten shekels, corresponding to the ten words (commandments). The golden vessels were one hundred and twenty in number, answering to the age of Moses. In the symbolism of the sacrifices the Jews were unable to refrain from showing their animosity to other nations. Twelve bullocks, one for each prince of the tribes, were offered for a sin offering. The sacrifice of the

twelve rams symbolized the future destruction of the twelve princes of Ishmael; and that of the twelve lambs the overthrow of the twelve princes of Persia. The twelve kids of the goats were a sin offering to make atonement for the sins of the twelve tribes. With each sacrifice the corresponding *mincha* was offered, that famine might be averted from the world. The twenty-four oxen symbolized the twenty-four orders of the priests, the sixty rams the age of Isaac when Jacob was born, the sixty goats the letters in the priestly benediction, and the sixty lambs were intended to atone for the sins of the sixty myriads of Israel.

The T. P. on Numb. xxix. says that the seventy bullocks offered during the feast of Tabernacles were sacrificed on behalf of the seventy nations of the world. The paraphrase on v. 31 falls into the error of representing the pouring out of the libation of water at the horn of the altar on the sixth day as if it were commanded in the law, although the ceremony was only invented by the later Jews. The rite was intended to symbolize either the thankfulness of the people for the showers of the past year, or to propitiate the goodwill of heaven, that the rains for the coming season might be abundant. On each of the seven days of the feast, fourteen lambs were sacrificed, making ninety-eight in all, in order to avert the ninety-eight maledictions.

An examination of the Targums will bring to light many legends in which some lesson or truth is concealed. Under an outer framework of oriental imagery there may be a hidden meaning, which, though not apparent at first sight, ultimately presents itself in a tangible shape. The T. O. contains few Hagadistic illustrations, but they abound in the T. P. and the T. J., where they are not always capable of being explained. In the second, it is said on Gen. i. that God created two great luminaries, which were at first equal in glory, and continued so for nearly twenty-one years. When the moon set on foot a false report about the sun, she was reduced in size, and appointed to rule the night, while the sun ruled the day. Under this legendary statement is enforced the moral lesson, that an envious and calumnious temper is sinful, and deserves to be punished. The story is copied from the Talmud in a condensed form. The same Targum says that God created man in two formations, with two hundred and forty-eight members, and three hundred and sixty-five nerves. He took dust from the place of the house of the sanctuary, that is from Mount Moriah, to which Adam and Eve retired after they were driven from paradise, and from the four winds,

and mixed it with water from all the streams of the earth. Man was created red, white, and black, and the breath of life having been breathed into his nostrils, he had within him the inspiration of a speaking spirit. This legend seems to be intended to teach the sanctity of the origin of man, the unity of the human race, whatever be the colour of the skin, because all are formed from the same substance, and the intention of God that the earth should be inhabited by human beings, having constitutions and habits suited to different climates. It also sets forward the Rabbinic notion, that three men, one red, one white, and one black, were created at first, by which supposition it was sought to account for diversities of colour and race. This appears from the inscription said to have been on the rod of Moses, which the T. P. says was created at the beginning of the world. It had engraved upon it the great and glorious name of God, the ten plagues with which the Egyptians were to be smitten, the three fathers of the world, the six mothers, and the names of the twelve tribes. When Moses was in Midian, he went into the chamber of Jethro to pray, and there found this wonderful rod with which he was to do wonders in Egypt, divide the sea, and bring forth water from the rock. He found it fixed in the midst of the floor, and he at once put forth his hand and took it. In the T. P. on Gen. iv. 8 there is a legendary account of the conversation between Cain and Abel before the latter was murdered, in which several of the expressions are borrowed from the Talmud. To the former are attributed the sceptical opinions of the Sadducees, while the latter is represented as contradicting them, the apparent intention of the narrative being to discredit what their opponents held to be erroneous tenets. In the history of Rachel in Gen. xxx. there is a Hagadistic account of Providence, of which the meaning is obvious. It is there said that there are four keys which God has not entrusted to any secondary power, whether angel or seraph. He has retained exclusively in His own hands control over the rain, over the food of man and beast, over life, and over the grave (Rev. i. 18), power over each being symbolically represented as a key. The same idea is also contained in the legendary description of the vision of Moses, when he went up to Mount Sinai to receive the law. He then witnessed the occupations in which God was each day engaged. One-fourth was employed in the study of the law, one-fourth in the execution of justice, one-fourth in uniting the marriage bonds of husband and wife, and the remainder in taking care of every created thing. This account

was borrowed from the Talmud, where it appears in a slightly different form, and with additions. Instead of uniting the marriage bond, the Almighty is described as playing with Leviathan, and instead of actually executing judgment, whenever He sees the world ripe for destruction, He allows His mercy to prevail, in order to afford to man further time for repentance.

In T. P. and T. J. legendary miracles, of which Scripture makes no mention, have been interwoven with the sacred narrative. They are to be accounted for by the craving for the wonderful with which the Jewish mind was possessed in later ages, and for the gratification of which it became necessary to invent miracles equally improbable and destitute of historical foundation. They are introduced either for the glorification of individuals, or to illustrate the way in which God miraculously preserved the people and destroyed their enemies, or to magnify the importance of the law. The legendary wonders which were wrought for Jacob when he was on his way from Beersheba to Haran, the miraculous signs which were said to have accompanied the act of Phinehas, and the well which Miriam carried along with her, supplying water to the people till she died (1 Cor. x.), of which mention is made in the later Targums, show the tendency to magnify illustrious Hebrews. The legendary miracle which was wrought for the destruction of the Edomites and Moabites near the brooks of Arnon, where, at a sign from God, the mountains where they lay in ambush rolled together and crushed them, so that their blood flowed down in streams to the city Zechiath (Numb. xxi.), finds a place in both the T. P. and T. J., and shows how powerful must have been the impression which the overthrow of these nations produced upon the Jewish mind. The wonders which attended the giving of the law on Mount Sinai were intensified by a great miracle, about which Scripture is silent. When Moses led the people forth from the camp to the foot of the mountain, it was suddenly torn from its base, and lifted into the air, where it became luminous like a beacon, and overshadowed the host. The miraculous signs, which were said to have been manifested when Moses began to pronounce the threatenings in Deut. xxviii., bear a striking resemblance to those which were wrought on another and a more remarkable occasion (Matt. xxviii. 50; 53), and excite the suspicion that one may have been copied from, or suggested by, the other. At the words of the lawgiver, the T. P. says that the earth trembled, the heavens were moved, the sun and moon were darkened, the

stars withdrew their light, the fathers of the world called out from their sepulchres, while all creatures were silent, and even the trees did not wave their branches: these being signs of the awe with which nature regarded the terrible denunciations.

Numerous legendary stories in like manner illustrate the tendency to indulge in the marvellous. In some cases they show an animus against particular persons, and in others they embody the traditions about remarkable events which were current when the Targums were compiled. These legends manifest a strong feeling against Og, Dathan and Abiram, Esau and Ishmael, Laban and Balaam. Apparent difficulties arise out of questions of time, but they are to be explained by the metempsychosis, which at the period of the compilation of the T. P. and the T. J. was a recognized doctrine among the Jews. In other cases, there are anachronisms which no ingenuity can explain, as when Abraham is said to have been cast into a furnace by Nimrod, from which he was miraculously delivered, and when Jacob is described as studying the law in the Beth Midrash of Shem. Og was one of the antediluvian giants, who was saved at the flood, being allowed by Noah to ride on the outside of the ark. He was one of the kings who took Lot captive: but afterwards, repenting of his share in the transaction, he sought out Abraham, and having found him on the eve of the Passover (?) making unleavened cakes, he informed him of what had happened to his relative. He is subsequently represented as taunting Abraham and Sarah because they were childless, telling them that they were like trees planted by the river side, which brought forth no fruit. He was kept alive for centuries, that he might see the multitude of their children, and when at length the Israelites came against him in Bashan, the lawgiver slew him with his own hand. The two men whom Moses found contending together in Egypt were Dathan and Abiram. After the Israelites had escaped, they are represented as remaining behind, and as consulting with Pharaoh about the best plan for pursuing them. They appear afterwards to have rejoined their countrymen in the wilderness. They were among the wicked persons who, disregarding the commandment of Moses, attempted to keep the manna overnight. In every allusion to them a strong hostile feeling is manifest. It also appears in the case of Laban and Balaam, who, although separated from each other by a long series of years, are regarded as the same person. The former was not like Og kept alive, but his soul transmigrated, till ultimately it came into the latter. The T. P. says that Laban was Balaam, that he was insane

from the vastness of his knowledge (Acts xxvi. 24), and that he was so highly esteemed in his own country that the inhabitants worshipped him. When his enchantments were of no avail against Israel, he advised Balak to furnish taverns, and to employ his own daughters, and other seductive women, to sell food and drink at a cheap rate, for the purpose of enticing the people into sin. When Moses sent an army to punish the Midianites, in the engagement which ensued, Balaam fled, and was pursued by Phinehas. In order to escape death, he rose into the air by the aid of his magical arts; but the warlike priest went after him, and having dissolved his enchantments by pronouncing the name of God, he seized him by the hair of his head, and brought him down to the earth again. Balaam supplicated for mercy, and promised that if his life were spared, he would never again curse the Israelites. Phinehas thereupon said to him, 'Art not thou Laban, who sought to destroy our father Jacob? Didst not thou go down into Egypt harbouring evil designs against his children? and didst not thou send the wicked Amalek against him? When thy curses were of no avail, didst not thou give the evil counsel which caused the death of three and twenty thousand of the people? Thy life cannot be spared.' Phinehas at once drew his sword and slew him. The T. O. on the confession to be made by him who offered the first fruits (Deut. xxvi. 5) is one of the few places where legend is to be found in this paraphrase, and it furnishes another illustration of the enmity entertained toward Laban by the Jews. Instead of the ordinary version, 'a Syrian ready to perish was my father,' the Targum has, 'Laban, the Aramite, sought to destroy my father.' 'Our father Jacob went down into the Aram at the beginning, and Laban sought to destroy him, but the Word of the Lord saved him out of his hands' (T. P.). Esau and Ishmael also receive their due share of animadversion. The T. P. says that on the day Abraham died, as Jacob was going to comfort his father, he met his brother coming exhausted from the wilderness. Thereupon ensued the sale of his birthright; and the paraphrase adds, that on the same day Esau had been previously guilty of four other sins. He had fallen into idolatry, committed murder, been guilty of impurity, and denied the resurrection of the dead; the last accusation being intended to show that Esau was a Sadducee. The T. J. on Deut. xxxii. 2 says that God revealed Himself in glory on Mount Seir to offer the laws to his descendants, but when they found that there was a commandment which forbade the committing of murder, they

refused to receive it. He then appeared on Mount Gabala to offer it to the descendants of Ishmael, but when they found that it forbade peculation and robbery, they in like manner rejected it. The next manifestation was on Mount Sinai, where, after they had promised obedience, God stretched forth His hand from the midst of the flaming fire, and gave His people the law.

Around the story of the liberation from Egypt there clustered a number of legendary traditions, for which there is no support in Scripture. In the night when the firstborn were slain, the voice of Pharaoh, calling to Moses and Aaron to depart, was heard in the land of Goshen, which was distant several hundred miles from his palace. Equally marvellous was the voice of Moses himself warning the people to make ready for their departure, which was miraculously strengthened so as to be heard throughout the whole land of Egypt. The coffin, containing the body of Joseph, had been sunk in the Nile, but the people remembered the injunctions of the patriarch; and having drawn it up again, they carried it away with them at their departure. After the passage of the Red Sea, the line of march did not lie through the country of the Philistines, although it was the nearest way, lest the people might be terrified by the sight of the bones of their countrymen, who had been destroyed by them three years before. According to the T. P., the number, apparently of fighting men, who journeyed towards Succoth was one hundred and thirty thousand. Seven clouds of glory protected the people. On each of their four sides was one. Over them was a fifth to protect them from hail, rain, and the heat of the sun. Beneath was another to prevent them from being injured by thorns, serpents, or scorpions, and in front went the seventh, to smooth the valleys, level the mountains, and prepare places for an encampment. The total number of men marching upon foot was six hundred thousand, each of whom had five children, who rode upon horses. They were accompanied by a multitude of strangers, numbering two hundred and forty myriads, and by a vast quantity of sheep, oxen, and cattle. The T.O. fixes the duration of the captivity at 450 years, while the T.P. assigns to it only half this period, reckoning the whole from the time that God spoke to Abraham (Gen. xv.), the interval between this event and the going down into Egypt making up the remainder. The T. P. on Deut. x. 6 says that when the people were on their way to Mosera, after the death of Aaron, Amalek, who reigned in Arad, sought to oppose

their progress. Some of them, who were discouraged by the war, set out on their return to Egypt, when they were pursued by the Levites, and a battle took place, in which many were slain on both sides. The survivors then returned, and rejoined the camp. The slaughter was supposed to be occasioned by the remissness of the people in mourning for Aaron.

It is strange that no Christian scholar has, up to this time, published an edition of these Targums, with notes critical and exegetical. The text is corrupt, and the versions are loose, frequently disagreeing with each other, and failing in consequence to command the confidence of those who are imperfectly acquainted with Chaldee. If the Targums should ever become the subject of systematic study, not a little will be discovered in them to repay the labour of investigation.

ART. IV.—THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

1. *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, e libris editis et manuscriptis, maxime Gallicanis, Germanicis, et Italicis collectus, recensitus notisque et prolegomenis illustratus.* By JOHN CHARLES THILO, Phil. et Theol. Doct. [Only Vol. I. published.] (Lipsiæ, 1832.)
2. *Evangelia Apocrypha; adhibitis plurimis Codicibus Græcis et Latinis maximam partem nunc primum consultis atque ineditorum copia insignibus.* Edidit CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF, Theol. et Phil. Dr., Theol. Prof. P. Ord. H. Lips. (Lipsiæ, 1853.)
3. *The Apocryphal New Testament.* Being all the Gospels, Epistles, and other pieces now extant, attributed in the first four centuries to Jesus Christ, His Apostles and their companions: and not included in the New Testament by its compilers. Fourth Edition. (London, 1821.)
4. *The Lost and Hostile Gospels.* An Essay on the Toledoth Jeschu, and the Petrine and Pauline Gospels of the first three Centuries of which Fragments remain. By the Rev. S. BARING-GOULD, M.A. (London and Edinburgh, 1874.)

5. *The Gospel According to the Hebrews.* Its Fragments Translated and Annotated, with a Critical Analysis of the External and Internal Evidence relating to it. By EDWARD BYRON NICHOLSON, M.A. (London, 1879.)
6. *The Apocryphal Gospels and other Documents relating to the History of Christ.* Translated from the Originals in Greek, Latin, Syriac, &c. With Notes, Scriptural References and Prolegomena. By B. HARRIS COWPER. (London, 1867.)
7. *Gospels, Apocryphal.* By Professor LIPSIVS. In Smith & Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, Vol. II. (London, 1880.)

THERE are two inquiries which the philosophical investigator of any religious system whatever will not fail to make. What are the sacred books of the religion, and what is their character? However complete his knowledge of the *external* history of the particular form of belief in question may be, he will feel that an essential part of its personality lies beyond the sphere of his analysis, so long as he has not examined with care those early and spontaneous utterances, whether records of its facts or statements of its principles, which, lasting on, have become in process of time its sacred books. For in them, if anywhere, he will be able to put his finger upon the pulse of its life current, and measure the throb of its energy; he can detect (or so he will fancy) something of its peculiar power, and learn what attraction it was that drew followers to believe in and to confess it. No matter how chequered its subsequent history, or how great the modifications which the original *depositum* has undergone, the perusal of such books will probably reveal in them each several strand of tendency or of principle as unmistakable, though it may be latent, elements in the warp and woof of thought, and running through all its mutations, as long as these are really developments of the original idea or ideas. If we go below the external phraseology of doctrinal definitions, and consider the currents of thought of which these are the outward embodiments, we shall be confronted at once with the existence of distinct, and probably to a certain degree of opposing, tendencies even in the earliest age of the religion we are examining; and at the same time with the fact that each of these is treated as a constituent part of the common body of belief and practice.

This is at once found to be the case if we apply the rule to the examination of the Christian religion in its earliest

age. The simple, graphic and literal delineations of the Synoptic Gospels have their place as faithful portraits side by side with the lofty idealism and the pregnant *γνώμαι* of the Fourth; the legalism of S. James and S. Peter, equally with the broad and tolerant catholicity of S. Paul, was admitted into the circle of distinctively Christian ideas, and both were essential to its completeness. It is, therefore, safe to infer that whatever properly belongs to the later development of a religion belongs also to the germ of it, and may be traced there with more or less distinctness; and conversely.

Only, however, with regard to the religion of Christ can it be thought that an inquiry of this kind will have more than a philosophical or (as the modern phrase is) an 'academic' character. And the moment that the terms of such a question are stated, the inquiry next in order leads at once into that subject with which this paper will be occupied. In other words, we are at once led to inquire, What were considered in the earliest ages of our era to be the Inspired or Sacred Books of the Christian Religion?

In our own age all varieties and denominations of Christians have happily determined the answer to that question with a practical unanimity. No more remarkable *consensus* of sentiment can be referred to in the history of opinion than that by which members of Confessions differing widely from each other in various ways accept and have always accepted, with the most trivial differences, the same Bible.

The answer was not, however, at all times so perfectly simple and well known as it would appear to the great mass of believers at the present time. Nor, though at the period when Christianity is found emerging into the light of history, its sacred books, *i.e.* the Gospels which record that Life which formed its occasion and root, are found to be four in number, can it be said that there is any reason in the nature of things why it should have been so. Pious writers like Origen, at the end of the second century or the beginning of the third, might indeed describe them as 'the [four] elements of the Faith of the Church, out of which the whole world reconciled to God in Christ was composed.'—(*Hom. in Johan.*) Or S. Irenæus might argue that the Gospels could not have been either more, or fewer in number, than *four*, and might give a variety of recondite reasons why this should have been the case.¹

¹ 'Neque autem plura [Evangelia] numero quam hæc sunt, neque rursus pauciora capit esse Ecclesia. Ἐπειδὴ τέσσαρα κλίματα τοῦ κόσμου

But it was felt, we may conjecture, even at the time that these were flights of pious fancy, intended for edification, and not to be taken strictly. It could never have been seriously argued that there ought to have been four Gospels and not more than four, and it is certain that the very idea of limiting to these four the attribute of authority and even the name of *Gospel* is itself the fruit of a later age, in which an entirely new and far higher connotation of ideas had grown up around this word: and which recognized in this way the facts which were before its eyes. The spectacle which the primitive ages presented was probably far different. It was emphatically the time when, among the Christian congregations, every one 'had a psalm, had a doctrine, had a tongue, had a revelation, had an interpretation' (1 Cor. xiv. 26). The great doctrines of Christianity, like its chief facts, were no secret. They had not the character of the Eleusinian mysteries, which were jealously guarded as the exclusive possession of the few who had obtained the privilege of being initiated. There were many and independent sources of the Christian tradition; and not a few of them, as it would seem, almost equally authentic and trustworthy. The career of Jesus was not, as S. Paul could fearlessly assert (Acts xxvi. 26), 'done in a corner,' but in the face of the world; and the witnesses to the facts were accordingly many. Every believer who had seen Him minister or heard Him discourse had his testimony to bear of what he had heard Him say or seen Him do. Every such rill of personal reminiscences must have trickled into the great reservoir of the mind of the Church, and counted for what it was worth in the gradual formation of a complete body of historical teaching. It thus becomes

ἐν ᾧ ἑσμὲν εἰσὶ, καὶ τέσσαρα καθολικὰ πνεύματα, κατέσπαρται δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς, στύλος δὲ καὶ στήριγμα ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ πνεῦμα ζωῆς· εἰκότως τέσσαρας ἔχειν αὐτὴν στύλους, πανταχόθεν πνεύοντας τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν, καὶ ἀναξωπυρῶντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. 'Ἐξ ὧν φανερόν, ὅτι ὁ τῶν ἀπάντων τεχνίτης Λόγος, ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν Χερουβιμ καὶ συνέχων τὰ πάντα, φανερωθεὶς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐνὶ δὲ πνεύματι συνεχόμενον.—(S. Iren. *Adv. Hær.* III. xi. 11; Massuet, III. xi. 8.) He goes on to remark that David praying for the Advent of the Logos exclaims: Thou that sittest on the Cherubin, appear! that the Cherubin are four-faced, and their faces images of the dispensation (τῆς πραγματείας, "dispositionis") of the Son of God. The first, the lion (signifying rule and royalty), corresponds to the Gospel of S. John. The second, the calf (signifying sacrifice and priesthood), to S. Luke. The third, face of a man (mystically showing forth the human Advent), to S. Matthew. The fourth, flying eagle, to S. Mark. He observes also that, as there are four ζῶα and four Gospels, so also there have been four Covenants: with *Noah* and *Abraham*, then the Law, and finally the Gospel. 'Καὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια τοῖτοις σύμφωνα ἐν οἷς ἐγκαθίσταται Χριστός.'

apparent upon what a spacious basis of facts the Christian tradition was at first formed, and is now supported, and it appears to us a great mistake to deny this, as is sometimes done. There are writers who seem to think it their duty to make it appear that the Four Gospels burst suddenly upon a world which was absolutely ignorant of their subject; who labour of set purpose to attenuate the thickly twisted web of concurrent, or perhaps a good deal entangled and confusing, testimonies, which unites the first of the Christian centuries with the third, until they reduce it to a mere cable stretching across the void. But it is evident, nevertheless, that the authority of the Four Gospels as historical documents is not weakened, but enormously strengthened, by giving its proper value to the fact that at the time when in all probability they were composed, there was in existence an enormous mass of contemporary evidence by which their statements could have been corroborated or, if need had been, corrected. We need not perhaps here explain that we are attempting to deal with the human aspect only of this question. Were we speaking of the entire problem of the origination of the Gospels, as it is brought before us in history, it would here be needful to discuss at length the unquestionable fact that much of this corroborating testimony very speedily was corrupted into legend more or less fanciful, and thus became untrustworthy for historical purposes; and then, at such a point in the inquiry, the influence of the inspiration which belongs to some of the records would at once show itself as a prominent factor in the process of their preservation. But we speak now of the human side of the question only. Some observations made by the late Dr. von Tischendorf in the outset of his *Prolegomena* bear upon this part of the matter that we have been considering, and the quotation of them may appropriately bring us to the commencement of our special subject of the Apocryphal Gospels, which are really the representatives or the survivals of that mass, of contemporary testimony of which we have been speaking:—

‘Longe alia’ (that is, from the Apocryphal Acts of Apostles) ‘evangeliorum apocryphorum ratio est. Ista enim quum plures editores per tria hæc sæcula invenerunt, tum a multis cognita tractata adhibita sunt. Neque id mirum. A primis enim ecclesiæ Christianæ sæculis quam famam habuerunt, ea non modo ad tempora proxime subsecuta transiit, sed etiam per totam fere ætatem mediam viguit; unde factum est ut et Græce et Latine sæpe transcriberentur. Atque in multas orientis tum occidentis linguas converterentur.’¹

• ¹ *Evang. Apocryph. Prolegom.*, p. vii.

It is probable, however, that the greater portion of this floating tradition of which we have spoken died out after a time, and when it may be supposed to have fulfilled its purpose; and did not crystallize into narratives more or less complete, *i.e.* into Gospels so called, at all. At all events it appears that the number of such narratives was comparatively but small; and that these in surprisingly few instances traverse the precise ground gone over by our Four Gospels. It would hardly be too much to say that in far the greater number of instances they presuppose the Four, and are subsidiary to them; perhaps amplifying their narratives with additional circumstances, or setting certain of their incidents in a framework of time and place somewhat differently, or in some other way working them over, and thus testifying to their previous existence and to the belief reposed in them. Let us take an example of this process. Every one is familiar with the simple account given by S. Luke (i. 1-21) of the circumstances which determined the place and time of our Lord's birth, and of the event itself, so that we need not quote it. But now compare with this the manner in which the writer or writers of the Gospel of *Pseudo-Matthew* overlaid this narrative with imaginative details. We take the version given by Mr. Harris Cowper, altering it slightly here and there from Tischendorf's (Latin) text:—

‘Now it came to pass some little time afterwards, that a registration took place according to the edict of Cæsar Augustus that the whole world was to be registered, every person in his own native place. This registration was made by Cyrinus, Præfect of Syria. It was needful therefore that Joseph should be registered with the Blessed Mary in Bethlehem, because Joseph and Mary, being of the tribe of Judah, and of the House and Family of David, were from thence. When therefore Joseph and the Blessed Mary were going by the way which leads to Bethlehem, Mary said to Joseph, “I see two peoples before me, the one weeping, and the other rejoicing.” And Joseph answered her, “Sit on thy beast and do not speak superfluous words.” Then there appeared before them a certain beautiful youth, clothed in a white garment, and he said to Joseph, “Why didst thou cail superfluous the words concerning the two peoples of whom Mary spake? for she saw the people of the Jews weeping, who have departed from their God, and the people of the Gentiles rejoicing, who have now approached and are made nigh unto the Lord, as He promised our fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; for the time is come that in the seed of Abraham a blessing shall be bestowed upon all nations.”’

In this, therefore, a great number of circumstantial details are added on to the narrative with which we are familiar.

As we proceed, we learn that the scene of the Nativity is a 'cave below a cavern, in which there was never any light, but always darkness, because it could not receive the light of day;' but which is illuminated with supernatural light all the time that the Virgin Mary continues in it. Hither are transferred the appearance of the Angels, and the singing of the hymn, 'Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis,' which S. Luke (ii. 14) makes to have taken place out on the open down at some distance from Bethlehem, and in the presence of the shepherds; and the Angels surround and adore the Newly Born '*super pedes suos mox stantem*.'

Two midwives, Zelomi and Salome,¹ are introduced as attending upon Mary, and they bear witness to her perpetual virginity in terms which perhaps betray the ideas of a later period: 'A virgin hath conceived, a virgin hath brought forth and hath continued a virgin.' One of them, however, is incredulous, and her hand is withered up, though afterwards restored by the touch of the clothes with which the Infant is wrapped. 'From evening until morning a great star shone above the cave.' This star is interpreted at the time as indicating 'the nativity of Christ [*i.e.* Messiah], who should restore the promise, not only to Israel, but to all nations,' by 'prophets who were in Jerusalem,' by whom the Magi (S. Matt. ii.) seem to be intended. Then the story appears to revert to S. Luke's narrative as a basis, and to attempt a kind of rough harmonization between that narrative and itself. Mary now leaves the cave, and entering a stable 'put her Child in the manger, and the ox and ass adored Him.' Then follows a reference to Is. i. 3 ('The ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib'), and another from Hab. iii. 2, which is very curious. It quotes 'between two animals Thou shalt be known.'

ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων γνωσθήσῃ, ἐν τῷ ἐγγιζέειν τὰ ἔτη ἐπιγνωσθήσῃ.

'In the midst of two animals Thou shalt be known: in the drawing near of the years Thou shalt be shown forth.'

This is from the LXX.

The Vulgate reads: 'Opus meum in medio annorum vivifica illud: in medio annorum notum facies.'

Our Authorized Version agrees with this: 'Revive Thy work in the midst of the years: in the midst of the years make known;' as in the Hebrew also.

From this point S. Luke's account of the Infancy is fol-

¹ The writer's *répertoire* of genuine Hebrew names seems to have been limited.

lowed exactly, sometimes word for word ; the writer nevertheless embellishing it with a touch here and there. Thus Simeon is said to have been 'eighty-four years old.' He takes the infant Jesus *into his mantle, and kissing His feet*, speaks as in S. Luke ii. 29.

Then the writer goes back to S. Matthew, premising this chapter with a notice that the Holy Family dwelt at Bethlehem for two years ; after this follows the account of the visit of the Magi, and the Flight into Egypt. We will not follow him further at this moment, since this remarkable narrative will come before us in the course of the methodical treatment of the subject. The reader may take this as a *typical instance* of comparison between the Four Gospels and the Apocryphal writings, in the cases, not specially frequent, where they traverse common ground. Rightly does Bishop Wordsworth observe that 'these Apocryphal books are of great value and interest, as confirming the substance of the Gospels, especially of S. Luke, and also as showing by contrast what the Evangelical narrative would in all probability have been if it had been left to human annalists, unassisted by the Spirit of God.' (*The Four Gospels*, S. Luke ii. 28.)

These writings may be divided into four classes :—

I. Narratives referring to the life of S. Mary, to the Birth of Jesus, and to the period of His Childhood.—(*Gospels of the Infancy*.)

II. Writings purporting to be accounts of our Lord's Boyhood.—(*Gospels of the Childhood*, τὰ παιδικὰ τοῦ κυρίου.)

III. Narratives of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord.¹

IV. Gospels in a similar sense of the word to that in which the Four are so called.

I. To the first class belong the *Protevangelium* or Gospel of S. James, the Gospel under the name of S. Matthew, or *Pseudo-Matthew*, the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, and the History of Joseph the Carpenter.

II. To the second the various forms, Greek and Latin, of the so-called Gospel of Thomas, and the Arabic Gospel of the Childhood.

III. To the third belong a number of compositions of very various character. *The Acts of Pilate*, *Gesta* or *Acta Pilati*,

¹ Tischendorf's classification is a little different. His words are : 'Quod ita instituum ut tria librorum horum evangelicorum genera distinguam, quorum primum comprehendit qui ad parentes Jesu atque ipsius ortum, alterum qui ad infantiam ejus, tertium qui ad fata ejus ultima spectant.'

known also as the Gospel of Nicodemus; the *Anaphora* of Pilate, 'Ἀναφορά Πιλάτου, i.e. the Report of Pilate [to Tiberius Cæsar]; the *Paradosis* of Pilate, viz. his trial and condemnation at Rome; the 'Death of Pilate,' and the 'Epistle of Pilate' (for this Roman governor was too marked a personage in the Christian tradition not to have fired the imagination and stimulated the invention of the fabricators of this class of historical romances); and finally, the *Descensus Christi ad Inferos*.

The Departure of Mary, *Transitus Mariæ*, κοίμησις τῆς Μαρίας, for it is found both in Greek and Latin, both by its popularity, its later date, and its polemical purpose, stands quite apart from those before mentioned. With this, and to some extent founded upon it, are two brief tracts, entitled respectively, *Visio Mariæ Virginis* and *Apocalypsis Mariæ*.

IV. Into a fourth class may be thrown certain writings of which only fragments now remain: first, the Gospel of the Hebrews, called among the Ebionites the Gospel according to the Apostles, and which was even known, probably because it was once thought to be the Hebrew original of the canonical Greek Gospel of S. Matthew, interchangeably by the name of that Gospel; and also the Gospel of S. Peter, the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Gospel of Tatian, variously known as the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Diatessaron (τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων) (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 29), and the Diapente (διὰ πέντε),¹ and which seems to have been simply a Harmony of Four Gospels, which can hardly have been other than our present Four.

There were modified *editions* of our four existing Gospels, put forth occasionally for sectarian purposes by various heretical leaders, such as Marcion's edition of S. Luke, the so-called Gospels of Cerinthus and Carpocrates, referred to by Epiphanius, whatever may have been the work upon which these were founded, which cannot now be determined; and some other doubtful writings, of which we only hear from third persons. These were not professedly *authoritative*; they were the results of 'freehandling' of the antecedent records, and were understood to depend upon the reputation of their authors for any influence they might obtain. They do not concern us further in this place.

¹ According to Victor Bishop of Capua, in the middle of the sixth century. But Mr. Nicholson, who has discussed this question minutely (*Gospel according to the Hebrews*, Appendix D, p. 132), argues that Victor's title, 'Diapente,' 'through five,' must be a mere slip of the pen.

We will now give some brief account of the chief works in each of the foregoing classes.

I. The great respect with which the 'Gospel of S. James' was regarded in the first Christian centuries is sufficiently shown by its title of the *Protevangelium*, or earliest Gospel. William Postellus, who translated the work from Greek into Latin and prepared an edition which appeared in 1552, seems to have thought that he had before him in this work either the original draft of the Gospels or a preface to them. He says:—

'Petrus Romæ non edidit Evangelium sed alteri Venetiarum duci Marco commendavit sine capite mysteriose scribendum : ut olim illi adesset hoc caput quod nunc vertimus totius Veteris Testamenti appendicibus Christum quovis modo prædicantibus necessarium, nedum Marco aut Lucæ.'

And again,

'Evangelii ad hunc diem desiderata basis et fundamentum, in quo suppletur summa fide quicquid posset optari.'¹

An opinion which was at once and vigorously repelled.

Thilo, however, observes:—

'Libri Græcorum ecclesiastici silentio sunt. prætermittendi, in quibus ad festa Joachimi et Annæ, ix. Sept. et xxv. Jul., item conceptionis, nativitatis, et præsentationis Mariæ, viii. Dec., viii. Sept. et xxi. Nov. plura ex Protevangelii auctoritate vel traditione proferuntur. Vides, quanta fuerit historiæ istius apud Græcos auctoritas et celebritas.'—(*Prolegom.* p. lxvii.)

A chain of testimonies going back to S. Epiphanius (A.D. 403) and S. Gregory Nyssen (A.D. 394) shows its great antiquity. But it is to be noted that it can be traced back no further than the date last mentioned, save by doubtful mentions in Origen (*Com. in Matt.* iii.), Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. 16), and a more probable citation by Justin Martyr (*Dial. c. Tryph.* 101).

There are other correspondences also (comp. *Protev.* c. 18, with *c. Tryph.* cap. 78). Tischendorf (*Prolegomena*, p. 13) is disposed to refer the work to the first half of the second century, arguing that Origen (who lived from A.D. 185 to A.D. 254) quoted from it in a manner which renders it improbable that it had been written but fifty years before. Nor does he see anything in the work inconsistent with this early date: 'accedit quod in libri argumento nihil est quod ab ingenio sæculi secundi medii abhorreat.' This consideration, however, does not seem to be of much weight; the references to the *Protevangelium* by

¹ See Thilo, *Prolegomena Nov. Test. Cod. Apoc.* tom. i. p. xlvi.

most early writers, moreover, differ from the text as it now exists, and it is probable that it has been to a great extent recast, even if it was not originally founded on an older work. In any case, it embodies the very earliest *popular traditions* with which we are acquainted. It begins with the birth of S. Mary, and extends to the slaughter of the Innocents at Bethlehem, and the murder of Zacharias in the Temple, a fact unknown to Scripture, unless we are to see a possible reference to it in S. Matt. xxii. 35.¹

¹ Commentators differ upon the question whether the Zacharias referred to in xxiii. 35 was the prophet of that name, or the father of S. John the Baptist, as here. The latter opinion is that of Origen, SS. Basil, Gregory Nyssen, of Theophylact, and several others among the Fathers. S. Peter of Alexandria (who sat from A.D. 321 to 325 according to S. Jerome) in some fragments of a work on Penitence, preserved by Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. iii. p. 341, repeats this view in words which, as they exactly agree with the work before us, may have been derived from it. The Massacre of the Innocents is described in words taken *verbatim* from S. Matt ii. 16; and he then proceeds 'with whom, having sought also another child born some time before [John Baptist], in order to slay him, and not having found him, he slew his father Zacharias; the child having fled with his mother Elizabeth, for which they are in no way blamed.'—(Can. xiii.)

In order to make the comments more intelligible, we may insert here the account of the death of Zacharias from the *Protevangelium*, which is very characteristic:—

'And when Herod knew that he was deceived by the Magi, he was angry and sent assassins, saying unto them, Slay the infants from two years old and under. And when Mary heard that they slew the infants, she was afraid, and took the Child and swathed it and put it in a crib for oxen. And Elizabeth, who heard that John was sought for, took him up into the hill country, and looked for somewhere to hide him; and there was no place of concealment. And Elizabeth groaned, and said with a loud voice, Mount of God, receive a mother with her child. And suddenly the mountain was divided and received her. And light shone through to them: for the angel of the Lord was with them, preserving them.

'And Herod sought after John, and sent his servants to Zacharias, saying, Where hast thou hidden thy son? And he answered and said to them, I am the minister of GOD, and I am busied with the temple of the LORD: I know not where my son is. And the servants went away and reported to Herod all these things; and Herod was angry and said, His son is going to be king of Israel. And he sent to him again, saying, Tell the truth: where is thy son? for thou knowest that thy blood is under my hand. And Zacharias said, I am a witness for GOD, if thou dost shed my blood; for the LORD will receive my spirit; for thou sheddest innocent blood in the porch of the LORD's temple. And about daybreak Zacharias was slain; and the children of Israel knew not that he was slain.

'But at the hour of greeting the priests went, and the blessing of Zacharias did not meet them according to custom. And the priests stood waiting for Zacharias to greet him with prayer, and to glorify the Most High. And when he tarried they were all afraid; but one of them ventured, and went in and perceived near the altar blood congealed, and a voice saying, Zacharias is murdered, and his blood shall not be wiped out until his avenger cometh. And when he heard the word he was afraid,

There are various points of curious interest in this series of marvels. That John, the son of Zacharias, was endangered in the massacre at Bethlehem has no support from the Canonical Scriptures, but is not in itself at all improbable, since John must have been but little older than his maternal relative, the Child Jesus. The dividing of the mountain has its parallels in Oriental story. The panels (φανώματα = *laquearia*) of the temple would seem to be a detail resting on accurate local knowledge, and the splitting *from top to bottom* may be a reminiscence of S. Mark xv. 38.

The 'literature' that has gathered around this subject contains some remarkable assertions. Thus, Origen (*Tract. xxvi. in Matt.*) declares the death of Zacharias to have been the work of *the Jews*, who were enraged because he had permitted Mary, after the birth of the Saviour, to stand in a certain place of the Temple, which was reserved for virgins, declaring to those who would have hindered her, 'she is worthy of the place of virgins, for she is a virgin.' And S. Jerome, commenting on S. Matt. xxiii. 35, mentions that there were 'brethren, too simple-minded, who show rocks of a reddish colour between the ruins of the temple and the altar, or in the goings-out of the gates which lead to Siloam, and think them to be stained with the blood of Zacharias.' And Tertullian (*adv. Gnost. cap. viii.*) has a similar statement, 'Zacharias is murdered between the altar and the temple, marking indelible stains of his blood upon the stones.' Pamelius, however, in his note on this passage refers this Zacharias to the son of Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiv. 20-22), and says as to the details, '*Hic peculiare Auctori, quod addat*': wrongly, as we have seen.

Upon the whole, while the book cannot be considered to have been written by James, the Lord's brother, yet it is unquestionably a very early collection of traditions, which circulated among the less intelligent and cultured of the primitive Christians, and were after a brief interval reduced to writing. We need not suppose that the name of James was assumed in any dishonest spirit. Probably many of these traditions had really proceeded, or were considered to proceed, from him, and were therefore labelled with his name. Who the actual compiler was must remain altogether unknown. The intimate knowledge he displays of Jewish

and went out and told the priests; and they ventured, and went in and saw what had occurred. And the wainscotings of the temple shrieked out, and were cleft from top to bottom. And they found not his body, but found his blood turned into stone. And they were afraid, and went out and told the people that Zacharias was murdered.'—(capp. 22-24.)

customs and ways of thinking would seem to show that the work proceeded from out of the small circle of Jewish Christianity. It is the ultimate authority for the statement that the parents of S. Mary were named Joachim and Anna; a statement not altogether easy to reconcile with S. Luke iii. 23-38 by those writers who consider the genealogy there given to be that of S. Mary.¹ A history of their grief at being childless, preceding the birth of Mary, seems to have been imitated from the narrative in S. Luke i. 5-25, concerning Zacharias and Elizabeth, the parents of S. John the Baptist. In the 'Gospel of the Nativity of Mary' (cap. 5), this imitation is carried on still further, to the later portions of the chapter. For S. Mary is provided a 'Presentation in the Temple,' like that of Christ; and Anna is made to utter a hymn of praise modelled on the 'Magnificat,' of which we will give a rendering in a note.²

On the same authority seems to rest a curious statement made by John Gerson in a sermon *De Nativ. Virginis Mariæ*, tom. iii. p. 59, and apparently intended to elucidate the difficulties respecting the *relatives* of Mary, and consequently of Jesus: 'Anna married three husbands, Joachim, Cleophas, and Saloma (?). From which three Anna bore three daughters, named Mary, whom Joseph, Alphæus and Zebedee respectively married. The first bore Jesus; the second, James, Joseph, Judah, and Simon; the third, James and John.' But it is all mere hypothesis. This is by the way.

A charge of anachronism has been brought against this narrative on account of its mention of the mitre or *πέταλον* as worn by the high priest. But it would seem that this mitre or golden 'plate,' a cap made of fine linen folded several times, and having in front a band of blue, to which the plate of gold with 'Holiness to the Lord' inscribed upon it was attached, was an integral part of the priestly vestments. S. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, as also the Apostle S. John, are said by Epiphanius to have actually worn, or to have been entitled to wear, this ornament.—(*Hær.*

¹ Epiphanius, Grotius, Michaelis, Godet, and others.

² 'The Lord, the God of Hosts, hath been mindful of His promise, and hath visited His people with a holy visitation, that He might humble the nations which rose against us, and turn their heart back again to Himself. He hath opened His ears to our prayers, and hath turned away from us the insults of our enemies. The barren woman hath been made a mother, and hath brought forth exultation and joy for Israel. Behold I was able to offer gifts unto the Lord, wherefore my enemies desired to hinder me. But the Lord hath turned them away from me, and hath given to me joy for evermore.'

xxix. 4, the passage is a well-known one: and Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v.)

Another parallel between this and the Canonical Gospels is found in the fasting of Zacharias for forty days and forty nights, which may be compared with the account of our Lord's temptation in S. Matt. iv. 2, after the model of which it was, in all probability, shaped. From this and other indications which we have already mentioned, we are justified in thinking it certain that the compiler, whoever he may have been, had at all events the Gospels of S. Matthew and S. Luke before him, and drew from them as much as he thought proper. With the whole of the Old Testament he was, if a Jew, as we have urged, of course familiar. But the characteristic portion of the work, that which gives to it its comparatively simple, homely, and inartificial character, is undoubtedly founded on popular, perhaps we may say *local*, tradition; nor that very far removed in time from the events. Nor is there any polemical purpose traceable in its straightforward narrations. Thus, for example, we have here perhaps the very earliest trace of the belief in the perpetual virginity of S. Mary; certainly the earliest with which the present writer is acquainted. It is here asserted plainly enough; but whereas the later writings, e.g. the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, style her 'the Lady Mary,' 'My Lady, Lady Mary,' and such like, there are no such adulatory phrases in the *Protevangelium*. As the *cultus* of S. Mary grew, so these later stories became changed in character.

It is right not to omit the remark that the book has been extensively interpolated. In chapters 18, 19, S. Joseph himself comes forward as the narrator; the style is altogether different from the rest of the work, and these chapters have clearly been introduced by a later and far inferior hand.

The second of the works referred to above, the *Pseudo-Gospel of Matthew*, is far later and less original. It is a mere compilation from other works: chapters i.-xvii. being derived from the *Protevangelium*; and xxvi.-xl.ii., professing to narrate the early years of Jesus, from the age of five to twelve years, almost wholly from the Manichæo-Gnostic composition entitled the *Gospel of Thomas*. It follows that its compilation must be referred to a far later period, and the same conclusion is at once forced upon the reader by the character of the contents. The compiler works over the narrative of the *Protevangelium* in a very different spirit, adding touches

¹ Gosp. of Inf. capp. xv. xvi. xviii. *et passim*.

everywhere, so as to completely transform the narrative. The former work had narrated in detail an appearance of an angel to Anna; this elaborates a similar vision to Joachim. The interview between the angel and Manoaah, in Judges xiii. 8-23, is obviously taken as the model for that between the angel and Joachim. But the latter has scruples to offer a sacrifice with his own hands, without the presence of a priest; and declares, 'I should not have dared to offer a burnt-offering to the Lord, unless thy command had given me priestly authority to offer it,' an idea clearly belonging to a later *stratum* of thought. The angel declares of the (as yet unborn) daughter that 'she shall be constituted mother of eternal benediction;' 'her blessedness shall be beyond that of all holy women, so that none can say that any hath been like her before her, or shall be after her in this world.' Nor are there wanting signs of the view that S. Mary must have had a marvellous conception, and even 'de Spiritu Sancto.'—(S. Bernard, *Ep.* 174, *ad Canonicos Lugdunenses.*)¹

The description given of the child Mary is by no means without touches of beauty, but shaped wholly according to a conventual model. We will give it here:—

'Now Mary was in admiration with all the people of Israel. When she was three years old she walked with so firm a step, spoke so perfectly, and was so assiduous in the praises of God, that all were astonished at her, and marvelled; and she was not regarded as a little child, but as an adult of about thirty years, she was so earnest in prayer. And her face was beautiful and splendid, to such a degree that scarcely anyone could look upon her countenance. Now she applied herself to wool-work, so that whatever the elder women could not do she accomplished when set to it in her tender age. And she adopted this rule for herself, that she would continue in prayer from morning until the third hour; from the third to the ninth hour she would occupy herself at her weaving, and from the ninth

¹ When, towards the end of the twelfth century (it was instituted about 1145) the Festival of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin began to be observed, S. Anne was also dignified with the title of Virgin. But S. Bernard says distinctly in the letter referred to above, 'I affirm that the Blessed Virgin conceived, and not that she also was conceived by a virgin; otherwise where is her prerogative as the mother of God, by which she alone is believed to exult both in the gift of an offspring and in the spotlessness of her body, if you ascribe the same to her mother also? This is not to increase, but to detract from, her honour.' The festival took in fact, in the Eastern Churches, the form of a Festival of S. Anne, being observed on December 9 (instead of on the 8th, as in the Roman Calendar) as 'the Conception of Anne, the mother of the Mother of God' (ἡ σύλληψις τῆς ἁγίας καὶ Θεοπρομήτορος Ἀννης). But this opinion of the perpetual virginity of S. Anne was condemned by Pope Innocent XI. in 1677, and died out after a time.

again she would apply herself to prayer. Nor did she retire from prayer until an angel of God appeared to her, from whose hand she received food; and so she advanced more and better in the work of God. Further, when the elder virgins left off the praises of God, she did not leave off, so that in God's praises and vigils no one was found before her, nor any more skilled in the wisdom of God's law, more humble in humility, more beautiful in singing, or more perfect in all virtue. Indeed, she was constant, immovable, unalterable, and daily advanced to better things. None saw her angry, or heard her reviling. For all her speech was so full of grace that the truth of God might be known to be in her tongue. She was ever diligent in prayer and in searching of the law, and was anxious not to sin by any word against her companions. Moreover, she feared to make any mistake in laughter, or by the sound of her lovely voice, or lest any insult or pride should show itself against her equal. She blessed the Lord without intermission; and, lest perchance even in her salutations she should cease from God's praise, if anyone saluted her, she answered by way of salutation, Thank God! From her it first originated that men, when they would salute each other, replied Thank God! With the food which she daily received from the hand of the angel she refreshed herself alone; but she distributed to the poor the food which she received from the priests. The angels of God were frequently seen to talk with her, and they most diligently obeyed her. If anyone that was sick touched her, that same hour he returned home whole.—(*Pseudo-Matthew*, chap. vi.)

It is, however, when the material afforded by the earlier work is exhausted that the real character of this new compiler becomes manifest. Starting from the point where the *Protevangelium* terminates, the compiler carries on the story; and taking the Flight into Egypt, probably from S. Matt. ii. 13-15; as the next incident in order, he embellishes it with all kinds of marvels. The reader accustomed to the Gospels will feel at once that he is in a new world, that of wild and unchecked imagination. On their journey through the desert the travellers are beset by many dragons who issue from a cave. 'But Jesus descending from the lap of His mother stood on His feet before the dragons, when they adored Him and then departed.'¹ Lions and leopards surround them and form a kind of bodyguard to them in the desert, not injuring the oxen and asses; and (to exhibit the marvellous still more powerfully) the sheep and rams, 'two oxen also and a cart, wherein they carried necessities,' which they had brought with them from Judæa, were unmolested. Mary

¹ Thilo in his note on this passage refers to Ps. cxlviii. 7, 'Praise the Lord from the earth, ye dragons and all deeps,' which is expressly quoted in some copies. But the readings are not uniform, and the exact quotation looks like an after-thought or side-note of some later reader.

wishes for the fruit of a palm tree under whose shade she is resting, but Joseph is anxious rather because the water in the bottles¹ is spent, and there is none for them and their companions to drink. Jesus commands the tree to bend down its fruit-bearing crown within reach of her hand to satisfy the one, and causes a spring² to break forth from its roots to relieve the thirst of the rest of the caravan.

Then Jesus rewards the palm by promising to make it henceforth the symbol of Christian victory (the anachronism is obvious); and a branch of it is forthwith taken away to paradise by an angel to be planted there. Joseph addresses Jesus as 'Lord,' complaining of the heat; and the Lord causes the distance of thirty days' journey to be traversed in one day. Having reached Egypt, they go into a temple to seek shelter, and all the 355³ idols which the temple contains fall upon their faces and are shattered.

Then the ruler of Egypt, Aphrodisius (Dux Aphrodisius), makes a speech to the people, reminding them of the fate of Pharaoh and his army, and exhorting them to acknowledge the 'God of our gods' in the Child before them. 'Then all the people of that city believed in the Lord God through Jesus Christ.'

The compiler has prefaced the next part of his work by quoting S. Matt. ii. 20; and chapters xxvi.-xlii. purport to narrate traits of the childhood of Jesus in Galilee and at Bethlehem. As may be surmised there is an abundance of marvels; but it is hard to infer from these what could have been the moral condition or the ethical standard of persons who could invent or who could tolerate such stories. For here, as still more markedly in the *Arabic Gospel of the Infancy*, chapters xxxvi.-xlix., we have stories such as might be told of a child-Puck or of an infant Frankenstein. They excite strong dislike and indignation. But there is this moral to be deduced from them: how perfectly inadequate the minds of persons of those ages must have been, not merely to originate the lofty conception of the Jesus which is found

¹ The word is curious, *utres*, bladders or leathern bottles.

² The original is surely unsurpassed in its cacophony: 'Cœpit ad radicem ejus fons aquarum egredi limpidissimus, frigidissimus et lucidissimus rimis.' We have noticed that the work is extant in the Latin only. It claims to be a translation rendered from the original Hebrew by no less a person than S. Jerome. But this is improbable, and the evidence points to a considerably later date for the translation. It could hardly have been *compiled* before the fifth century.

³ No doubt an error for 365. Thilo omits the passage altogether, which, however, Tischendorf admits without remark.

in the Four Gospels, but even to comprehend it, and to write so as to sustain the *moral elevation* of the character when they had it before them. When they tried to do so, such caricatures as the stories we have before us were all that they could accomplish !

Fitful, passionate, malevolent, revengeful : even Joseph and Mary are in fear and dread of Him. He curses His playmate who had interfered with the water channels which He had made in the mud, and the boy dies ; and this in two separate stories. Another thrusts himself against the shoulder of Jesus, and is punished with instant death. Another, who throws a stone at Him, hitting Him on the shoulder, meets the same fate. Some boys refuse to play with Him, and He changes them into kids. When He goes to a master to be taught the alphabet, and the master strikes Him, his hand is withered and he dies ; so that at length Joseph is represented as saying to Mary, ' Henceforth we will not let Him go out of the house, for whoever opposeth Him is punished with death.'

We forbear to notice particularly another class, that of the merely trifling and futile marvels, such as Jesus making birds of clay and giving them life ; or pulling out to the required length the wooden plank which had been cut of too small a size ; or enlarging the throne, which Joseph had made too small, so that it might fit the place meant for it. We go on to mention the very few things said here which seem to be in any degree whatever conformed to the type of the Canonical Gospels. We have noticed but two : a singularly beautiful apologue (intended no doubt as matter of fact) in which Jesus goes into the den of a lioness, and is adored :—

' The lions went before Him, and the lions' whelps played together before His feet. . . . Then Jesus began to say to the people, " How much better than you are the beasts, which recognize and glorify their Lord ; and ye, men who are made in the image and likeness of God, know Him not. Beasts acknowledge Me, and grow gentle ; men see Me and know Me not."—(*Pseud.-Matt.* xxxv.)

A miracle which reminds the reader of the handkerchiefs or aprons from the body of S. Paul (Acts xix. 12) is narrated here ; namely, the restoration of a dead man to life in Capernaum by a kerchief sent by Jesus to be laid upon the dead man's face with the words, ' Jesus save thee ! ' ; ' and the dead forthwith arose from his bed, and asked *who Jesus was.*' Perhaps, however, the simplest and most like Scripture of all the stories found here is the following, which is represented as having taken place at Bethlehem :—

'On a certain day Joseph called his first-born son James to him and sent him into the garden to gather herbs for the making of pottage. And Jesus followed his brother James into the garden, and Joseph and Mary knew it not. And while James gathered herbs there suddenly came a viper out of a hole and wounded the hand of James, and he began to cry out through excessive pain. And when already fainting, he said with a bitter cry, Alas ! alas ! a wicked viper has wounded my hand. And Jesus, who stood opposite, at that bitter cry ran to James and took hold of his hand, and did no more than merely breathe upon the hand of James, and revived him. And immediately James was healed and the serpent dead. And Joseph and Mary knew not what had happened, but at the cry of James, and at the bidding of Jesus, they ran into the garden, and found the serpent already dead and James quite healed.'—(*Pseud.-Matt.* c. xxxi.)

It is scarcely needful to remark that one and all of these stories violate Scripture precedent in extending the exercise of miraculous powers to the period of the childhood of Jesus, and thus compromising the reality of His Humanity; for it would be unnatural that a child should behave in so unchildlike a manner. Beyond this, there is a *manufactured* look about all of them which would alone prevent their receiving much consideration.

Leaving this, and passing over without further mention Class II., which we have already dealt with by anticipation, we pass on to the Third Class, comprising works referring to the period of our Lord's Trial and Condemnation, Passion and Resurrection.

The former class were mainly preliminary to the Canonical Gospels, and professed to deal with periods of the lives of Jesus or of Mary, of which the Four either spoke little and briefly, or passed them over altogether without notice. These, on the contrary, are supplementary to the Four, generally show marks of having used them largely, while supplementing them with masses of generally unimportant, though often marvellous, details. Probably these are mostly based upon current traditions, and there may be comparatively little in (at all events the best of) them that is the product of pure invention.

This can hardly be held with much confidence of the most important in this class, *The Acts of Pilate*, a work extant in Greek, Latin and Coptic, and which may, with a good deal of probability, be referred to the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century. Tischendorf indeed assigns to it a far greater antiquity; for he can trace, as he thinks, a chain of testimonies to it from Justin Martyr, in the middle of the second century, to Gregory of Tours in the sixth. His words are quite worth quotation:—

'Jam vero quæ singula vidimus historica, ea quandam testimoni-
orum seriem efficiunt. Justinus quæ acta Pilati laudat medio sæculo
secundo, eadem Tertullianus initio sæculi tertii percenset: porro
eadem Maximinus imperator initio quarti sæculi suspecta atque irrita
reddere studuit apposis aliis novis iisque maxime contumeliosis,
quo eodem sæculo quarto eadem commemorant Eusebius et Epiph-
anios: insequitur quinto sæculo Orosius (*Histor. vii. 14*): sexto Gre-
gorius Turonensis, qui apud ipsos illa retineri asserit.

'Ea vero quæ ad nos pervenerunt acta jam antiquissimo codice
Latino palimpsesto, quinti vel sexti sæculi, item papyraceis foliis Coptis
ejusdem certe ætatis, continentur.

'An nihilominus putemus hæc nostra diversa esse ab antiquis illis,
quamvis quicquid de suis veteres docent, id inveniamus in nostris?

'Quo tandem modo subito perire poterant quæ jam inde ab
Justinii tempore tanta Christianis auctoritate valere videbantur? Aut
quæ tandem, quum vetera tam bona tantæque ex longo usu auctoritatis
esse sciret, alia nova fictum fuisse putemus, ac finxisse vero cum
tanto successu ut nova sua Græcis, Latinis, Coptis mirum in modum
commendaret iisque vetera loco moveret atque exstingeret?

'Quæ quum ita sint, concludo, acta Pilati quæ ad nos pervenerunt
in rei summa ab iis quæ jam secundo sæculo exstitisse Justinus docet
non diversa esse, nisi quod sensim multifariam immutata atque inter-
polata censenda sunt. Quæ interpolatio quum plane ex more apocry-
phorum librorum sit, tam significata ab ipsis est veteribus. Mira autem
textus varietas, quæ in textibus nostris et commentariis ante oculos
posita est, interpolatorum partes luculenter testatur.'—(*Prolegomena*,
p. 64.)

It is very doubtful, however, whether, with regard to Justin
and Tertullian, the two important links of this chain, the facts
supposed to have been quoted by them from the original *Acts
of Pilate* are derived thence at all; certainly they are not
found in the work now extant under that name.

Though we do not know that any thing like a uniform
system of reports from provincial governors, concerning cases
of capital punishment, had been established in the Roman
Empire as early as the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, yet it
is far from improbable that cases of importance were re-
ported; and if such a report were really made by Pilate to
his superior, it may have become known, or at least the facts
it contained may have become known, to some Christian
writer. However this may have been, it is clear that the
document before us is not such a report, nor, as it would
seem, does it even contain any facts that would have been
contained in such a report; and therefore can hardly have
been founded upon any document of that kind. Essentially
it is a religious romance, founded on the Gospels, and, to
some small extent perhaps, on traditions current at the time

it was composed. But though it must thus be denied anything like an historical foundation, yet the evident piety and devotion with which the work is written, the number of facts borrowed from the Canonical Gospels, which, although 'worked over,' are yet treated, if we may so speak, in an 'evangelical' spirit, and the care taken to model the *quasi*-original portions of it after the pattern of occurrences narrated in the Old Testament Scriptures, contribute to raise it distinctly above other compositions of its class. It was exceedingly popular in the Middle Ages, and to it may be traced many incidents depicted by artists of the period or alluded to in popular legends.¹ The bowing of the standards in the *prætorium* to Christ when He entered is derived from it. The narrative begins somewhat abruptly with the summoning of Jesus by Pilate at the request of the chief priests. The dream of Pilate's wife is worked in at this point, in fair agreement with the Canonical Gospels. The Jews charge Jesus with being a magician, and say, 'He hath sent a dream to thy wife.' To this charge the words of Pilate (S. Mark xv. 4) are made to refer, instead of to the main accusation of treason: and the way should be noticed in which the bearing of our Lord's words (S. John xix. 11) is shifted, so as to substitute for the mysterious and hardly definable meaning attaching to them a sense far lower, indeed, but perfectly clear and easy of comprehension to the average understanding.

'And Pilate called Jesus and said unto Him: What do these testify against Thee? Dost Thou say nothing? And Jesus said, Except they had power they would say nothing. For everyone of

¹ There have been many English editions of the work, from one printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1509 to that of Joseph Wilson (1767). The latter Lowndes calls 'a poor translation.' It departs widely from the Latin text in places, and adds many fabulous particulars, some of them very singular. Indeed the prologue is sufficiently curious to be quoted:—

'It befell in the nineteenth year of the Seignory of Tiberius Cæsar, Emperor of Rome, and in the Seignory of Herod, who was King of Galilee, the eighth kalend of April, which is the 25th day of March, the fourth year of the son of Velom, who was Counsellor of Rome, and Olympias had been afore two hundred years and two. At this time Joseph and Annas were lords above all justices of peace, mayors and Jews. Nicodemus, who was a worthy prince, did write this blessed history in Hebrew; and Theodosius the Emperor did translate it out of Hebrew into Latin; and Bishop Turpin did translate it out of Latin into French; and hereafter did ensue this blessed history called the *Gospel of Nicodemus*.'

The translator does not say what kind of MS. he had before him, and it would be hard to tell with certainty; but it *looks* as if the *Gospel of Nicodemus* had somehow been joined on to, or had got mixed up with, a number of stories of the age of Charlemagne.

them hath power over his own mouth to speak both good and evil. They will see.'—(*Gosp. Nicod.* ch. ii.)

The writer evidently quite misunderstood our Lord's words. The accusers adduce three charges: first, that He was born of fornication: ¹ second, 'that Thy birth in Bethlehem became the slaughter of babes;' third, that 'Thy father Joseph and Thy mother Mary fled into Egypt.'

By repeated cross-examination Pilate ascertains that the accusation was due to jealousy, 'because He healeth on the Sabbath,' and becomes very anxious to acquit Jesus. To the famous question, What is truth? which the Canonical Gospels represent as having been left unanswered, we are scarcely surprised to find that this author is ready with a reply which he puts into the mouth of Jesus: 'Jesus saith to him, Truth is from heaven. Pilate saith, Is truth not upon earth? Jesus saith to Pilate, Thou seest how they who say the truth are judged by those who have power upon earth.'

¹ This is one of the many signs of the late date of the book. Such a charge was apparently never made in our Lord's lifetime, but in the second century the unbelieving Jews are said to have sent messengers all over the world with letters containing calumnies against Jesus. Celsus (as we learn from Origen, *con. Cels.* lib. i. c. xxviii.) had repeated in his anti-Christian treatise, *Ἀληθὴς Λόγος*, with coarse jocularly this very slander of the Jews respecting the Blessed Virgin Mary and the soldier Panthera. He seems not to have derived it from Apocryphal sources, but to have heard it himself from the Jews. It is quite needless to repeat his words, which we have before us: ('execranda illa blasphemia' Mosheim well calls them). Certain stories appeared in the Talmud, Babylon Gemara (*Tract. Sanhed.* fol. 107, and *Tract. Schabbath*, lib. xii. fol. 104), respecting a Jeschu called variously son of Stada and Pandira or Panthera. These some of the Jews referred to Jesus the Son of Mary; but it is very doubtful if the same person was originally meant. Mr. S. Baring-Gould endeavours, with fair success, to show that this Jeschu lived about a hundred years earlier than the Saviour.

In the *Toledoth Jeschu* or *Birth of Jesus*, a collection of stories made with a bitter anti-Christian intention, this identification was made of set purpose, and all the scandalous stories which could be found relating to the one are there heaped upon the memory of the other. We need not be surprised at the glee with which Voltaire (*Lettre sur les Juifs*) seizes on these. But his statement of date, '*elle paroît être du premier siècle, et même écrite avant les Évangiles*,' is demonstrably far too early, as Mr. Baring-Gould's 'at the outside the twelfth century' (*Lost and Hostile Gospels*, p. 69) is apparently somewhat too late.

What is very surprising is the fact that the name of Panthera is inserted into the genealogy of Jesus by Christian writers. Thus Epiphanius (*Har.* 78) says that 'Joseph and Cleophas were sons of James, called by the surname of Panther.' And S. John Damascene (*De Orthodox. Fid.* lib. iv. cap. 15) makes the still more circumstantial statement, that 'from Levi were born Melchi and Panthera, from Panthera Barpanthera, from Barpanthera Joachim, the father of the Mother of God.' This must be mere theory wherever it appears.

Pilate then in a private interview points out to the accusers that even on their own showing Jesus had done 'nothing worthy of death; for your accusation is for healing, and for the profanation of the Sabbath.' He plainly says at length, 'He doth not deserve to be crucified.' Then Nicodemus stands up to plead for Him; the paralytic, the woman with an issue of blood, and others spoken of in the Gospels, testify of the cures worked upon them. Of course all this is merely a dramatic rendering of the arguments in favour of Jesus, and almost seems to have been meant as such. The Jews renew the charge against Jesus of being a King, adducing as proof that the Magi had made offerings to Him as king; and in the investigation it comes out that Jesus is the Child on whose account Herod massacred the Hebrew children; and this increases Pilate's reluctance to act against Him. After this follows the washing of his hands: and then Pilate commanded the curtain¹ of the judgment seat where he sat to be drawn, and the delivery of the sentence follows. The names of the two malefactors are given variously as Dismas, Dimas and Demas, for the one; Gestas, Gesmas and Stegas for the other. The *Arabic Gospel of the Infancy* makes them to have been Titus and Dumachus (*i.g.* Θεομάχος).

It is perhaps in strict agreement with the title of the book, that the sending Jesus to Herod is altogether omitted. So also the first (and ineffectual) scourging intended to excite the pity of the Jews, and the ill-treatment by the soldiers in the palace itself. It continues in chapter x. :—

'And when they came to the place they stripped Him of His garments, and put about Him a linen cloth,² and they put a crown of thorns on Him about His head.'

¹ τὸ βῆλον, *i.e.* *velum*. It is not improbable that we have here a small fragment of genuine local detail, preserved by tradition; 'for the sittings of the judges were accustomed to be often hidden by a curtain; and some causes were taken knowledge of with the curtain *raised*, and others with it *drawn*. This took place in weightier and especially in criminal trials, when they required fuller deliberation; so that the judges might be separated from the sight of the litigants, the defendants and the rest of the common people.' This is made still more probable by a passage in S. Chrysostom (*Hom. V. in 2 Tim.*), where 'παρὰ τὸ πέραςμα στήσου, *ad velum sistere* nihil aliud est quam coram iudice in iudicio sistere. Hinc quando iudex ad sententiam pronuntiandam progrediebatur, velum contrahebatur aut dicebatur contrahi.' Other quotations bearing on the point may be seen in *Thilo*, pp. 576, 577.

² The almost unbroken practice in representations of the Crucifixion has of course been in accordance with the detail given by our author, though it finds no support from the Canonical Gospels. It was not usual apparently to represent the Crucifixion in the earliest ages in its real form, but in a highly symbolical and conventional manner, generally as the

In the account of the Crucifixion, S. Luke is very closely followed. The darkness is attributed by the Jews to an eclipse of the sun, happening in the usual manner; the author forgetting, or perhaps not understanding, that the passover was at the full of the moon, and that, the moon being at that time on the opposite side of the earth 'in opposition,' an eclipse of the sun was impossible. After the death of Jesus, the Jews imprison Joseph of Arimathæa; but he is miraculously released, and, returning to the house of Nicodemus, gives the following account of an appearance of Jesus to him:—

'And Joseph said, On the preparation, about the tenth hour, ye put me in prison, and I remained so all the sabbath. And about midnight, as I stood and prayed, the house wherein ye shut me was suspended by the four corners, and I saw, as it were, a flash of light in my eyes. And being afraid, I fell to the ground. And some one took me by the hand, and removed me from the place where I had

Lamb bearing the Cross. Aringhi (*Rom. Subt.* ii. 478) says, 'Crux, cum Christo illi fixo, nequitiam effigiari olim solebat.' And the early manner of representing the Passion of Christ: 'Mysticis res coloribus adumbrata. . . . emblematicis figuratisque modis; sub innocui videlicet agni iuxta Crucis lignum placide consistentis typo.'—(Quoted by Tyrwhitt.)

The first permanent representation even of the simple cross was probably one which Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ix. 9) testifies to have been set up at Rome, beside the statue of Constantine, after his defeat of Maxentius in A.D. 312. It is not until the seventh century that crucifixes appear, nor do they seem to have been used in churches until the eighth or ninth. Then the Figure of the Crucified is *always* clothed in a long tunic, and there is not the least appeal to historical realism or display of anatomical detail. That seems to have come in only with the Renaissance. The Blood of Christ as shed upon the Cross is often treated mystically, and connected with the idea of the Holy Communion. In an example over the door of the Convent of S. Mark's, Florence, it is represented as a *crimson cord* coming from the feet and twined below about a skull. (For a very interesting monograph upon this subject, see Mr. Tyrwhitt's article 'Crucifix' in Smith and Cheetham's *Dict. of Chr. Antig.*) Consult also an engraving in the illustrated edition of Farrar's *Life of Christ* (p. 696), extracted from Rocca's *Thesaur. Pontif.*, for some varieties of idealization, with which the Crucifixion is represented. One, in which the Crucified is arrayed in girded alb and imperial crown, is of especial beauty.

The Fathers, however, generally write as believing that 'Jesum a militibus Romanis vestibus suis spoliatum et nudum in Crucem datum esse.' Nevertheless it was believed at Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle) that this *operimentum* 'velum illud sive linteum' was actually preserved there. An argument has been attempted to be drawn in favour of the existence of such a practice from the prophecy of our Lord to S. Peter (S. John xxi. 18) referring to his crucifixion, *ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς ἐκτενείς τὰς χεῖράς σου, καὶ ἄλλος σε ζώσει κ.τ.λ.* The word *ζωννύειν*, however, appears never to be used in such a sense by the Biblical writers, though Thucydides (i. 6) and also Homer use it in the sense of girding the loins.

fallen, and a quantity of water was poured out (upon me) from my head to my feet; and a smell of myrrh came to my nostrils. And He wiped my face, and kissed me, and said to me, Fear not, Joseph; open thy eyes, and see who it is that talketh with thee. And looking up, I saw Jesus. And being afraid, I thought it was an apparition, and said the commandments. And He spake to me. And now know ye not that if an apparition meeteth a man, and heareth the commandments, it taketh to flight? And seeing that He spake to me, I said, Rabbi Elias. And He said to me, I am not Elias. And I said to Him, Who art Thou, Lord? And He said to me, I am Jesus, whose body thou didst beg from Pilate; and thou didst wrap Me in clean linen, and didst put a napkin about My head, and didst put Me in thy new tomb, and didst roll a great stone to the door of the sepulchre. And I said to Him that talked with me, Show me the place where I laid Thee. And He took me, and showed me the place where I laid Him, and the linen cloth laid therein, and the napkin which was about His head; and I knew that it was Jesus. And He took me by the hand, and set me, the doors being shut, inside my house; and He led me to my bed, and said to me, Peace be to thee. And He kissed me, and said to me, Go not out of thine house for forty days; for behold, I go into Galilee, unto my brethren.'—*Gosp. Nicod.* chap. xv.

Signs and wonders multiply. To the rulers of the synagogue come 'Phinehas a priest, and Adda a teacher, and Aggæus a Levite,' with a narrative of the Ascension of Jesus from the Mount of Olives.¹ Here we have another palpable quotation from S. Mark xvi. 15 onward. Annas and Caiaphas hold a kind of conference, in which various witnesses testify to the wonderful appearances and actions of Jesus. At length an entire conversion is brought about in their minds, and they sum up their new convictions in a little sermon, which we will give:—

'Then Annas and Caiaphas said, Ye have rightly said, What is written in the law of Moses, that no man saw the death of Enoch, and no man mentioned the death of Moses. But Jesus gave account to Pilate, and we saw Him receiving blows, and spittings in His face; and the soldiers put a crown of thorns upon Him, and He was scourged, and received sentence from Pilate, and was crucified on Calvary, and two robbers with Him, and they gave Him to drink vinegar and gall; and Longinus,² the soldier, pierced His side with

¹ This seems on the whole the best reading. But Tischendorf reads, εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Μαμὶλχ, and almost every MS. has a different reading, Μαμβήχ, Μαλήχ, Μοφήκ, Μομφή. *Malech* or *Melech* means a king ('tota regio montana circa Hierosolyma urbem regiam'), and it is thought that the name would apply particularly to the Mount of Olives.

² *Longinus*. It is curious, that this name, round which so many stories have gathered, should have originated in sheer mistake. Yet it seems that the name meant simply a spearman (Λογγίνος ὁ στρατιώτης = λόγχιμος).

a spear, and Joseph, our honourable father, begged His body ; and as he saith, He arose ; and as the three teachers say, We saw Him taken up to heaven. And Rabbi Levi spake, attesting what was spoken by Rabbi Simeon, and that he said, Behold He is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign to be spoken against. And all the teachers said to all the people of the Lord, If this is from the Lord, and it is marvellous in your eyes, ye shall know assuredly, O house of Jacob, that it is written, Cursed is every-one that hangeth on a tree. And another Scripture teacheth, The gods which made not heaven and earth shall perish. If his memorial is unto the year, which is called Jubel, know ye that He will prevail for ever, and hath raised up for Himself a new people.'—(*Gosp. Nicod.* chap. xvi.)

The version of this legend of Longinus in one of the many English editions is very curious :—

'And then the Jews commanded that a knight should be brought forth, whose name was Logenious ; and this Logenious was blind ; and the princes of the law made him to pierce our Lord ; and there came out of His side both blood and water ; and the blood ran down by the spear's shaft into Logenious's hand, and he, by adventure, wip'd his eyes with his hand, and he anon did see.'

The well-known story about S. Amphibalus finds a parallel, also English, in this work ; for there are some observations made in it respecting an imaginary woman named *Sydonia* (from *συνδών*, the linen cloth in which our Lord's Body was wrapped, according to S. Matt. xxvii. 59, which is followed

In one MS., however, 'the centurion Longinus,' *Λογγίνος ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος*, is distinguished from the soldier who pierced the side of Christ. But they were soon, and generally, identified. S. Gregory Nyssen, in one of his epistles, seems to state that Longinus was afterwards converted to Christianity, and became a bishop in Cappadocia.

Martin Polonus, a chronicler of the thirteenth century, tells a story (*A Chronicle to the Year 1277*) that Longinus was a blind man, and received his sight from the blood bursting out of the side of Christ, and dropping upon his eyes. He mentions also an epitaph, in which he did not himself believe, 'commentitium epitaphium,' near Lyons, at the confluence of the Arar (Saône) and the Rhone, in the Church of S. Mary, inscribed : *Qui Salvatoris latus in cruce cuspidē fixit, Longinus, hic jacet.*

It was a great question in the Middle Ages whether it was the right side of our Saviour that was pierced, or the left, or whether both were pierced. Some of the versions say distinctly that it was the right side (*εἰς στρατιώτης ἐδόχενσε τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ πλευρᾷ*), and the most ancient representations on pictures and medals favour this view, which seems to be the older one. It gives us some idea of the minute ceremonial of those days, when we find a writer on Ritual discussing the question, with respect to the communicating of the Pope in solemn celebration of the Eucharist : *Cur summus Pontifex in solenni Communionē sinistro e solii latere sacratissimæ Hostiæ allatæ sibi partem, sanguinis vero a latere dextro sibi porrecti, partem assumat.*'—(Angelo Rocca *De Sac. Com. Sum. Pont.* Quæst. III. Rom. 1610.)

in chapter xi. of this book). Probably further search would bring to light other instances, besides these three, of the working of an anthropomorphizing faculty in such stories.

To this *Gospel of Nicodemus* is appended, in some copies, *The Descent of Christ to the Underworld*, as Part II. It is a narrative supposed to be told by two sons of Simeon, who had been raised from the dead, by whom does not appear. It is an entire fiction, apparently due to some unknown Christian writer long after the date of Part I., and, if it is worth while to hazard a guess as to the intention of it, seems, from its reciting in a brief form the chief points in the Life of Jesus, to have had a didactic or educational purpose. It is full of anachronisms, as the author seems not merely to have been careless of preserving an appearance of veri-similitude and agreement with the manners of the time, but not even to have an idea of what was meant by it; so that he boldly transfers the manners and tone of thought belonging to his own time into that he is writing of. Tischendorf's view is somewhat different from this, and we confess that we have a difficulty in reconciling it with the facts as they appear to us. He thinks that the *Descensus Christi ad Inferos* 'confirms and even completes the witness given in the *Acts of Pilate* to the Resurrection of Christ from the dead;' which it does in two ways: 'first by relating that He not only returned Himself unto life, but also brought back others with Him; and in the second place by detailing the wonderful actions performed by Him immediately after He had breathed forth His life upon the Cross [which two particulars do not seem to be divided by any very marked distinction]. And since each of these was in entire agreement with the Christology prevailing among the Jews about the time of Christ, and which taught the first resurrection of the righteous and the descent of Christ into the grave, the design of the author of the book is easily understood not to have been different from the *Acts of Pilate*. For even in these respects he shows his associates that Christ had satisfied the expectation of the Jews concerning their Messiah. How entirely this is in agreement with the apostolic age itself, not to go beyond the limits of the Sacred Books, is proved by S. Matt. xxvii. 52 seq., Eph. iv. 8 seq., 1 S. Peter iii. 18 seq., on which passages, with the addition of S. Luke xxiii. 43, this entire history of the sons of Simeon affords a most conspicuous commentary.—(*Prolegom.* p. 67.)

As to its date, he has nothing to say but that it was written after the *Acts of Pilate* and the *Protevangelium*. Probably long after, we should feel inclined to add. Thilo

has pointed out many similarities between this treatise and the Rabbinical writings. The most curious of these passages is that which forms chapter iii. of the *Descensus ad Inferos*, and seems to have been borrowed from some Rabbinical source, and adapted to Christian purposes:—

‘Therefore while John was thus teaching, those who were in Hades, and the first made and first father Adam¹ heard it, he saith to his son Seth, My son, I wish thee to tell the forefathers of the race of men, and to the prophets, whither I sent thee when I was about to die. And Seth said, Prophets and patriarchs, hearken. When my father Adam, the first made, was about to die, he sent me to offer prayer to God very near the gate of Paradise, that He would guide me by an angel to the tree of mercy, and let me take oil and anoint my father, and that he might recover from his illness. Which also I did. And after my prayer the angel of the Lord came and said to me, Seth, what dost thou ask? dost thou ask the oil which restoreth the sick, or the tree which poureth forth such oil, because of the sickness of thy father? This is not now to be found. Go, therefore, and tell thy father that, after 5,500 years are accomplished from the creation of the world, there shall descend upon earth

¹ The expression is to be noticed: ὁ πρωτόπλαστος καὶ προπάτωρ, which in the Latin text is rendered by the hybrid word *protoparens*.

Around the name of Seth, the third son of Adam, innumerable legends have gathered; and writers, Jewish, Christian, Catholic and heretical, and even Mahomedan, have each their tale to tell about him. From a Jewish treatise entitled *Parva Genesis*, Georgius Syncellus brings a story that [Seth] was informed by angels respecting the future coming of the Saviour, and imparted the knowledge of this and many other future events to his parents.

Fabricius has a still more wonderful narrative, that Seth, having been sent by his father to the gate of Paradise, begged and obtained from the angel guards a bough of the Tree of Life, which was planted in the earth and grew; so that from this tree were made the rod of Moses, the rod of Aaron, the tree with which the waters of Marah were sweetened (Exod. xv. 25), the pole on which the brazen serpent was raised (Num. xxi. 9), and, finally, the Cross of Christ!

The Sethites or Ophites, an obscure sect of the fourth century, made Seth a prominent figure in their system, attributing to him a semi-divine character.

Respecting the ‘Tree of Life’ there is a curious passage in the book of Origen against Celsus (lib. vi. c. 27), where he professedly quotes a passage from Celsus about the *quasi*-baptism of these very Sethites or Ophites: that he who imparted the seal was called ‘father’; but that he who was marked with it was called the younger, and ‘son,’ and answered, ‘I have been anointed with white oil from the Tree of Life,’ evidently a trace of the same notion as that in the quotation given above.

Goethe also has referred to this legend: ‘Die drei gegrabenen Namen brachte Seth der Fromme vom Paradiese hernieder, als er das Oel der Barmherzigkeit suchte’ (‘the three names which Seth the Pious brought down from Paradise when he sought the Oil of Mercy. Whosoever carries this ring on his finger will find himself free from all dangers,’ &c. &c.)—(*Der Reineke Fuchs*, cant. x. v. 21, &c.)

the only begotten Son of God, being made man, and He shall anoint him with such oil, and he shall arise, and with water and with the Holy Spirit shall wash both Himself and His descendants, and these shall be healed of all sickness : but now this cannot be.'—(p. 302.)

It is time, however, to bring this review of the Apocryphal literature of the first ages to a close ; nor can we at this point of it go on to notice the very interesting treatise, *Transitus Mariæ*, in which the first beginnings of the *cultus* of S. Mary may be discerned.

Nor, again, can we include in this paper a discussion of the *Lost Gospels* of Christendom, if such there have been ; a point which reasonably admits of two opinions. The Class IV., of which we spoke some pages back, is one of that somewhat unsatisfactory class of questions upon which, while much may be said, very little can be decided ; because the scanty evidence which exists is not of a decisive character, but mostly hearsay, and that ambiguous at the least. Mr. Nicholson, indeed, whose learned work we noticed some numbers since (*Church Quarterly Review*, April 1880), thinks that at least one Gospel, that of the Hebrews, has been thus lost, with the exception of a few fragments. But we find much difficulty in accepting his view.

A consideration of the character of this Apocryphal literature, as judged by the specimens we have given, will show that the only importance of these quasi-Gospels is to be looked for in the relation between them and the Canonical Gospels. We have selected, as our readers will easily understand, the most important examples for consideration ; nor have we occupied their time with the wild and bizarre fictions of *The Gospel of S. Thomas* or of the *Arabic History of Joseph the Carpenter*. But the conviction deepens in the mind the longer we read them, how little of the story of the sacred Life of Jesus upon earth they have to tell. They throw here and there side-lights on this or that passage of the Gospels ; they do nothing more. And, however difficult it may be to the Christian reader to comprehend that of the many other things not recorded in the Four Gospels, 'the which if they should be written everyone, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written,' one and all have utterly perished ; yet the pious and instructed reader will rise from a perusal of the whole of this literature with a conviction that here at least is to be found no salvage from the whelming waves of Time, no priceless fragment from the sacred store of the unrecorded words and deeds of the Incarnate Lord.

Nay, more, they tend by the force of contrast between the true and the false, the really antique and the fabricated imitation, to emphasize and make the reader feel more strongly than ever before the unapproachable superiority of the Four Gospels. The distinction between the Scripture 'given by inspiration of God' and the ordinary products of the human mind becomes real and tangible as he reads on; and since he sees how different is the Jesus conceived by the best intellect of the time from the Jesus represented in the Four Gospels, and how immeasurably below the inspired description is the uninspired copy, the superiority of the one to the other can hardly fail to be thenceforth the most cogent of arguments. He will feel instinctively that the 'inspiration' claimed for the one has introduced a factor into its origin which has made it different from the rest in kind, not merely in degree.

The Apocryphal writings, finally, furnish a class of evidence to the Gospels, considered as narrations of historical facts, such as is obtainable in no other way. Partly they *presuppose* the truth of the separate facts, because they use them as *points d'appui* (so to speak) around which to arrange their webs of prismatic fiction; partly, strange as the remark may appear, they *imply* that the facts of our Saviour's Life had already been narrated, because they make no attempt to narrate them, but undertake separate departments and incidents of the Ministry of Christ for their own treatment.

Thus, to illustrate the former of these two remarks, the Apocryphal writers surround the Birth of Christ with a tissue of marvellous and, for the most part, incredible incidents, extending far back beyond the childhood and even beyond the birth of His Virgin Mother; but at least they testify unconsciously to their belief in such an event as the Birth of Jesus, and show that they acknowledged something extraordinary in its character.

Then, again, not one of the narratives professes to deal with the Life of Christ. Not one covers the entire ground of the Synoptic Gospels; and what is this fact but an involuntary and unintentional confession that the ground was already occupied, the work already done! They pass over to the end of our Lord's earthly career, and essay to fill up the *lacunæ* (numerous enough, no doubt: for the Gospels were never intended to be complete histories according to the modern scale) in the Canonical accounts of the Passion.

We will close this paper with one further remark. It is the Gospel of S. Luke which is at once the latest of the Synoptic Gospels in time, and also the most conformed of

these to the modern type of narrative. The author does not claim to have himself been cognizant personally of the facts as they occurred, but to have informed himself of them by diligent inquiry and investigation¹ (S. Luke i. 3).

And it is instructive to remark that it is in this very Gospel that we have a greatly increased affluence of detail and of carefully arranged information, at precisely the two points we have referred to above as the characteristic scenes of these later writings; namely, the period of the Birth, Infancy, and Childhood of Jesus, and, less markedly, of the Passion. For, on a comparison of the Four Gospels, we find the length of the respective narratives to be as follows:—

Events of the Birth and Infancy	Verses	The Passion	Verses
S. Matthew i. 18-25, and ii.	30	xxvi. 36-75, and xxvii.	105
S. Mark	—	xiv. 32-72, and xv.	87
S. Luke i. 5-80, and ii.	127	xxii. 39-71, and xxiii.	88
S. John	—	xviii. and xix.	82

This is surely a significant fact, and one from which we may safely draw a cautious inference respecting the mental history of those times. We may, at all events, gather from it the ruling ideas and disposition of thought with which the mass of Christians regarded the Life of Christ in the age when the Four Gospels had but recently been composed, and when the lingering remnants of personal knowledge concerning it, which were not incorporated in those Four, had not yet wholly died out.

ART. V.—ON SOME FACTS OF PLANT LIFE.

1. *The Power of Movement in Plants.* By CHARLES DARWIN, LL.D., F.R.S., assisted by FRANCIS DARWIN. With illustrations. (London, 1880.)
2. *Text Book of Botany, Morphological and Physiological.* By JULIUS SACHS, Professor of Botany in the University of Würzburg. Translated by A. W. BENNETT, M.A. &c. Lecturer on Botany at S. Thomas's Hospital, assisted by W. T. THISELTON DYER, M.A. &c. (Oxford, 1875.)

IN the development of knowledge, whereby the human mind more and more approximates the microcosm of thought

¹ Dr. Godet says on this: 'The author does not seek to put himself in the rank of the Christian authorities; he places himself modestly among men of the second order.'

within to the universe without, the observation of the *many* precedes the conception of the *one*. Variety is seen at the outset. The unity that underlies variety is not realized until careful observation has gathered a store of facts and mature reason has succeeded in duly co-ordinating them. Were we called upon to name the chief characteristic of the vast scientific progress of the past two centuries, we could scarcely define it better than by saying that it has consisted in the growing perception of unity pervading the universe. Proteus-like, that unity presents itself to our senses under a multitude of disguises:—

‘*Omnia transformat sese in miracula rerum.*’

It has been the achievement of modern science to detect identity under widely different forms. The mutual convertibility of various forms of energy is an illustration at once familiar and striking.

Probably no one will dispute the fact that modern science has been marked by success in the direction just pointed out. There may be less agreement as to its supreme importance, and we know that there is less agreement still as to the significance of the ultimate unity to which on various converging lines our thoughts are drawn. The theist is certainly entitled to say that a progressive discovery of unity was just what his own principles might have led him to expect. A contrary result would have destroyed his confidence either in science or in religion. To him the gradual spelling out of unity by the patient labour of science is her most important achievement. Her material triumphs, her subjugation of natural forces to human control, have doubtless multiplied the active powers of man. But railways and telegraphs and all the varied mechanical inventions which have facilitated production and destruction could not, by themselves, however indirectly serviceable, elevate their possessors. They merely render the animal more powerful, more fleet, more formidable, or, generally, better furnished in the struggle for existence. Yet the believer in revelation may point even to these lower triumphs as simply achieving a predestined royalty, as giving effect to that ancient charter which, on any theory of its date, contains a predictive element: that charter whereby man was invested with the lordship over all the terrestrial creation and bidden to ‘subdue’ the earth.

A far higher character belongs, however, to that insight into the order of the visible universe, that perception gained by modern science of the majestic simplicity which forms the

basis of inexhaustible variety. Here, if anywhere, the modern thinker may claim to stand upon a higher intellectual level than the ancient ; for here he is realizing his higher nature. He is developing a faculty in the possession of which, so far as regards the terrestrial creation, he stands alone. Whatever may be said of the reasoning power of brutes, it is certain that man alone can even attempt to 'comprehend the heaven.' He alone can even ask for a plan in this 'mighty maze' of the universe. He *can* do so ; and, so far as he penetrates to the perception of unity, he succeeds in deciphering the plan. So far his mind is a reflection, dim indeed and partial, but true, of the Divine Mind. The mere fact that knowledge could thus 'grow from more to more,' and the lofty estimate which we have given of the value of that advance, are both in accord with the ancient record already referred to, which declares that man was made 'in the image of God.'

The first grand cosmic truth discovered in modern times is that with which Newton's name is connected, and which was published about two centuries ago ; the law of gravitation. The *law* ; for, after all, no more than this has been ascertained. The physical cause of gravitation, if physical cause there be, is still involved in the deepest mystery. There is just as much reason to ask *why* the apple falls as in Newton's day. He never supposed that he had discovered the cause, nor, in fact, did he hold the theory, since highly favoured, of *actio in distans*. All he did was to complete and prove the mathematical formula.

The interval since Newton's day, more especially the latter half of it, has been fruitful in discoveries in physiology, chemistry, astronomy, and other departments, which amount almost to a revelation of the constitution of the visible universe. In regard to all these discoveries, whether that of the laws of chemical combination, or of types of structure in plants and in animals, or of the constitution of the sun and stars, along with vast accessions to our knowledge of the extent and variety of the visible universe, deeper insight has been gained into its elemental simplicity, into its unity of origin and government. Everywhere runs, so to say, the writ of one Supreme Court ; everywhere uniformity of law proclaims one Lawgiver. Nor is His rule more suggested by the light which science casts upon the universe than by the mystery of the shadows which everywhere attend that light and seem to deepen as it grows brighter. Our knowledge brings our ignorance into stronger relief. What we observed with regard to gravitation is equally true with

regard to every fundamental or primary law that we formulate. Science, begging at the outset the principle of causation, may trace many a lower development to the operation of a higher and comprehensive law, but, in the end, the most accomplished scientist is fain to confess that science can give no reason for that elemental law.

In the ensuing pages we propose to gather from modern botanical science a few illustrations of the two points just named; namely, the increased perception of unity in variety, and the conviction of ignorance that awaits us in the midst of our most signal triumphs.

At first sight it might appear that, beyond certain analogical resemblances, the vegetable and the animal world have nothing in common, or that, at any rate, it is only in the lowest organisms of the two, those in which the distinctive characteristics are scarcely perceptible, that the life of the vegetable and of the animal resemble each other. A very slight acquaintance with animal and vegetable physiology is sufficient to dispel this idea. Indeed, the mere superficial enumeration of familiar processes or functions, which are absent from inorganic matter, but present themselves in the organism of plant and animal alike, might at least raise the question whether there is not something more than just so much analogy between the two as the poet and the teacher by parable have found to serve the purposes of pleasing or instructing. We may even say that the very analogies discovered by the poet and the teacher by parable are often not mere superficial resemblances but results of the fact that there is really only one kingdom of terrestrial life, and that the general laws to which life is subject are the same for both provinces of that one kingdom. Life, death, decomposition of the once living structure into inorganic elements: these are common to both provinces. So also are respiration, nutrition, circulation, sexual generation. Even the capacity to transmit impressions from one portion of the organism to another, which is associated in animals with the possession of a nervous system, is shown by Mr. Darwin, in his work on *The Power of Movement in Plants*, to be a widely diffused, if not a general, attribute of plant life. To this point we shall return later on.

Plants, then, are the seat of processes which admit of being denoted by the terms employed to describe animal functions. Perhaps, however, it may still be said that there is only a superficial resemblance between the phenomenon in the animal and its homonym in the vegetable; or that the

same term is applied to both for the sole reason that they answer the same purpose, just as, to draw an illustration from the animal world, the organ of flight in bird and insect alike is called a wing, though, structurally considered, the one has nothing in common with the other. A true wing in any vertebrate animal is formed by some modification of the anterior member, whereas the wings of insects 'are formed by an extension of the superficial tegumentary membrane over a framework that is not derived from an *internal* osseous skeleton, but is an extension of the denser subjacent layer of the *external* integument.'¹ Between the wing of the insect and that of the bird there is only analogy. It is something beyond analogy that brings under common terms various processes that take place in our own bodies and in the trees of the wood. It is essential identity. As to the mode in which the processes are accomplished, there is indeed great variety not only between the two, so-called kingdoms, but even within the limits of either kingdom. But if we sum the differences between the two kingdoms we find them accounted for by the requirements of animal life being superadded to those of vegetable life, and in making this discovery we believe that we are so far deciphering the architectonic plan of the visible universe. The key to the differences is contained in the truth enunciated in the following words:—

'The whole *nisus* of Vegetative existence consists in the activity of the organs of Nutrition and Reproduction; but, on the other hand, the *nisus* of Animal life tends towards the evolution of the faculties of Sensation and of Self-determined motion, and, in its highest manifestation, to that of the Intelligence and the Will.'²

In illustration of the essential identity of the processes named, which do not exhaust the list of those that might be named, we shall confine ourselves at the present moment almost entirely to respiration. An adequate description of them all would only be in place in a botanical treatise. Circulation alone, and its relations to nutrition on the one hand, and to respiration on the other, would require more space than we have at command. We must, however, guard against being supposed to affirm that the diffusion of juices in plants is effected after the mode that is most familiar to us in the animal world. The circulatory process that prevails in plants is not by way of long continuous channels like our arteries and veins, but from cell to cell through the cell walls

¹ *Principles of Comparative Physiology*, p. 4. By W. B. Carpenter, M.D. Fourth edition, London, 1854. ² *Ibid.* p. 37.

by what is called *endosmose*. Yet the upward movement from the soil of water with various substances in solution is so energetic that, when a stem—of the vine, for instance—is cut off below all leaves and branches (in which growth and evaporation might cause a kind of suction), the pressure with which exudation takes place is found to amount to 76 centimetres of mercury, or one atmosphere. Even in the stinging-nettle the force of the ascending sap under similar conditions amounts to several centimetres.¹

Now in what does respiration essentially consist? We will give the answer in the words of Professor Sachs:—

‘The respiration of plants consists, as in animals, in the continual absorption of atmospheric oxygen into the tissues, where it causes oxidation of the assimilated substances and other chemical changes resulting from this. The formation and exhalation of carbon dioxide,’ or, as it is better known, carbonic acid gas, ‘the carbon resulting from the decomposition of organic compounds, may always be directly observed.’²

Respiration then, though it supplies a stimulus without which the chemical changes on which life depends could not proceed, is not a nutritive function. It does not add to the weight of the organism. On the contrary, in the early stage of plant life, germination, ‘the weight of the solid contents of the seed diminishes considerably, though its bulk increases by the absorption of moisture.’³ The reason is that respiration is going on, and under its stimulus the life of the germ is being supported at the expense of the material stored up in the seed, while as yet no process has been set on foot, nor any organ developed, for the introduction of carbon from the air.

The absorption of oxygen and the exhalation of carbonic acid constitute respiration. It is necessary to bear in mind this very definite answer to our question, in order that we may duly distinguish *this universal function of all living terrestrial organisms* from another process which will occupy us shortly, which belongs to the vegetable world alone and is not without exceptions even here. Respiration is as necessary for the continuance of life in the plant as it is in the animal, though the former can bear a longer temporary suspension of the function than, to speak generally, the latter. By day, by night, in light or in darkness, the living plant is absorbing oxygen and exhaling carbonic acid. Even those plants, such

¹ See *Text Book of Botany*, p. 600. Sachs.

² *Ibid.* p. 644.

³ *Principles of Comparative Physiology*, p. 288. Carpenter.

as fungi, and many parasites, which derive the elements of nutrition from organic compounds already formed, are no exceptions to the rule. In point of fact the incessant performance of the function is more easily detected in these than in higher orders of vegetation, because it is not liable to be masked by the other process which we are now about to describe.

One of the constituents of our atmosphere, as is well known, is carbonic acid gas. It forms, however, but a very minute proportion of it, not more than one part in 2,000. Yet it is the carbon, itself only a portion of this thinly diffused compound, that is derived from the atmosphere to become the chief of the solid materials of all vegetable and animal organisms without exception. The animal is incapable of withdrawing it from the atmosphere. The work is done for all terrestrial life, whether in plant or animal, by the cells containing chlorophyll, which are spread over the green parts of plants. Plants which have no chlorophyll cells of their own are dependent upon those which have them. They are either parasites and draw directly from their hosts compounds of carbon which the latter have assimilated, or they are saprophytes and live on decomposing organic compounds containing the carbon which has been originally obtained from the atmosphere by the action of the chlorophyll cells of other plants. All animals, it is scarcely necessary to say, are dependent for their nutrition either directly or indirectly upon plants. The chlorophyll cell is thus the indispensable and single portal, so to say, by which the chief substance that goes to build every living organism, from the humblest of the fungi to the human body, passes from the inorganic to the organic world.

The extraction of carbon from the carbonic acid is accompanied by the disengagement of oxygen into the air. Consequently the process now under consideration has precisely the opposite effect upon the surrounding atmosphere to that of respiration. And since there are times when the fixation of carbon and liberation of oxygen cease altogether, and times when they proceed more energetically than the counter process of respiration, namely, the absorption of oxygen and emission of carbonic acid gas, the analysis of air in which plants have been confined will show at one time an addition of carbonic acid gas, at another of oxygen. The fixation of carbon cannot go on without light: it is most energetic in direct sunlight, though it is always going on with considerable energy in diffused daylight; in darkness it ceases altogether.

Hence arose the erroneous theory, formerly much in vogue, that plants have two respirations, one by day, the other by night, and of inverse orders. The truth of the matter is, as M. Corenwinder, who, though not by any means the first to state it, has given the fullest proofs of it, declares, that 'in all living beings there is only one true respiration, and it is the same for all. The part played by the chlorophyll is of a different order; it is an act of assimilation.'¹

At the same time it must be borne in mind that the consumption of oxygen by plants in respiration bears a very small proportion to that of carbon as food and the consequent evolution of oxygen; while, on the other hand, the manifold activities of animal life necessitate so large a consumption of oxygen and formation of carbonic acid gas as would soon render the atmosphere positively poisonous, if the balance were not maintained by vegetation. This beautiful mutual adjustment of the two great orders of living beings has been too often pointed out to require further remark.

During germination, as we have said above, the life of the embryo plant is supported by the material stored up in the seed. At the outset, though respiration begins at once, no organ exists for the assimilation of carbon. The plant will only begin to support itself when it has a green surface submitted to the influence of light. In his recent work on *The Power of Movement in Plants*, Mr. Darwin mentions a beautiful contrivance, the object of which is to facilitate the emergence of cotyledons² from the seed coats, in order that the light may reach them. Mr. Darwin gives to M. Flahault the credit of first describing it, but he has himself verified M. Flahault's observations. In the Cucurbitaceæ, or Gourd tribe, the seed coat forms a tough and rather hard envelope, which, however, may be easily split in two halves. The mere swelling of the cotyledons is sufficient to effect their liberation by thus bursting the inclosure. But the plant is provided with the means

¹ See *Annal. des Sciences Naturelles*, 6^{me} sér. tome vi. 'Botanique,' p. 316.

² The cotyledons are 'organs which represent the first leaves,' and in many plants, though unlike the true leaves subsequently formed, assume the appearance and function of leaves. Plants are distinguished as Acotyledonous, Monocotyledonous, and Dicotyledonous—*i.e.* without cotyledon, with one, with two. In some species one cotyledon, in others two, remain undeveloped, rudimentary structures. Mr. Darwin points to the fact that in these cases the nutrition of the infant plant is provided for by the formation of a kind of bulb, and he is of opinion that the thickening of the radicle or hypocotyl in plants, which formerly produced two cotyledons, preceded and led to the abortion of these, or one of them, as being no longer necessary.—*The Power of Movement in Plants*, pp. 94-98.

by which their liberation, under ordinary circumstances, may be achieved two or three days earlier than they could accomplish it by themselves. To quote Mr. Darwin's description—

'A heel or peg is developed on one side of the summit of the radicle and this holds down the lower half of the seed coats (the radicle being fixed in the ground), whilst the continued growth of the arched hypocotyl,' the part of the stem above the radicle and below the cotyledons, 'forces upward the upper half, and tears asunder the seed coats at one end, and the cotyledons are then easily withdrawn.'

Mr. Darwin tells us that this contrivance is very general among the *Cucurbitaceæ*, and concludes with the remark that 'few cases can be advanced of a structure better adapted for a special purpose.'¹

We have seen that there is one uniform process of respiration² for all forms of terrestrial life, and one source of the chief material of all terrestrial organisms. We need not linger upon the marvellous harmony between the scientific discovery of the effect of light upon the chlorophyll cell and the statement in Genesis that light preceded vegetation and vegetation preceded animal life. This point has been frequently insisted on, and it will suffice now to have recalled it to mind.

Where, however, can we find a more striking example of the modern perception of unity than in the two processes described? And what does that unity suggest? To our minds it suggests with overwhelming force the thought of a pre-ordered course. If life, according to some materialist theories, were the result of some chance combination of atoms, we should expect to find it, here and now, under one set of conditions, at another time and place under another set. Is it conceivable that chance should tie down life to these two universal conditions, the necessity of respiration and absolute dependence upon the action of a certain vegetable cell? In reflecting upon the character of those ultimate atoms which are inferred to form the substance of all matter,

¹ *The Power of Movement in Plants*, p. 101 seq.

² Fishes find sufficient air in the surrounding water, unless the temperature rises above a certain point. In hot weather their increased vital activity, approaching that of warm-blooded animals, creates a demand for more oxygen than they obtain from the water. To meet this demand they rise to the surface and take in air. They cannot live any considerable time out of water, owing to the drying up of the membrane of the gills where this is exposed to the air, and the flapping together of the filaments of the gills when water is no longer flowing between and separating them.—Carpenter's *Principles of Comparative Physiology*, p. 315.

scientists have found in the uniformity that is coupled with their marvellous combining possibilities the traces of One Will. They bear the mark, we are told, 'of manufactured articles.' With equal propriety, while we point to the uniformity that, notwithstanding the marvellous variability with which it is linked, prevails throughout the realm of terrestrial life, we claim to assert that every living organism proclaims its community of origin with every other, that—

'All are but parts of one stupendous whole'¹—

and that all bear the impress of One Supreme Will.

But, after all, has science solved the mystery of life? She has done no more here than in regard to gravitation. She has formulated the law that terrestrial life is dependent upon the atmosphere for the stimulus of oxygen, and upon the same atmosphere, acted upon by light in the minute chamber of the vegetable cell, for carbon. Why oxygen should be charged with its important function we know not. We can at most compare its behaviour in the living organism to the part it plays in combustion and in other chemical processes in non-living substance. Why light should perform the marvellous operation which it does perform in the chlorophyll cell we know not. At the most we can discover which element of the luminous ray is the most effective; the yellow, we are told, doing more work than all the rest together; and we can find in the action of light upon the sensitive plates of the photographer some resemblance to its action upon chlorophyll. We cannot assert that all manifestations of life in all other regions of the universe must be subject even to these elementary conditions which we find on earth. All that we know is, that life on earth can only manifest itself under these conditions, which, we have abundant reason to believe, are imposed upon it by Creative Power.

We turn now to the consideration of a phenomenon in the world of plants to which a term derived from animal life has been commonly but incorrectly applied. There is nothing beyond the merest superficial resemblance to justify our speaking of the Sleep of Plants. What we mean by sleep is a state or condition characterized by a suspension of those faculties which distinguish animal life; that is to say, in the words of Dr. Carpenter's definition quoted above, 'the faculties of Sensation and of Self-determined motion, and, in its

¹ So far we may go with Pope. We shrink from the apparent pantheism of the second half of his couplet—

'Whose body Nature is, and God the soul.'

highest manifestation, that of the Intelligence and the Will.' Consequently, this condition cannot be correctly predicated of organisms that do not possess any of these faculties. Yet when the petals of many flowers were observed to close in the afternoon or evening, and open again the following morning,¹ when in so many plants the leaves were observed to bend downwards or upwards, or to close together at or before the hour of human repose, the time

'Quo prima quies mortalibus ægris
Incipit,'

it was not unnatural to suppose that the plant passed into a condition analogous to that of the sleep of animals. Modern science had well-nigh dispelled this idea; but an explanation of the purpose served by the so-called sleep movements was wanting as regards leaves and cotyledons. As regards the so-called sleep movements of the petals of flowers, it has been shown 'that they are caused or regulated more by temperature than by the alternations of light and darkness.' Their chief purpose seems to be the protection of the delicate organs of reproduction, the pistils and stamens, from cold wind, and rain; but they also benefit many plants by preventing the entrance of 'nocturnal insects which may be ill-adapted for their fertilization, and [of] the well-adapted kinds at periods when the temperature is not favourable for fertilization.'² One of the latest scientific achievements of Mr. Darwin, whose powers of observation and of lucid exposition, whose ingenuity in questioning Nature and skill in interpreting her answers, are beyond praise, is to furnish a solution of the problem, which was yet unsolved, with regard to the so-called sleep of leaves. It appears to us that he has proved his point, and that in this case 'thought has wedded fact.'

Mr. Darwin remarks that since the idea is all but universally given up of there being any analogy between the sleep of animals and these movements in plants, the erroneous term should be given up likewise. He suggests *nyctitropism*, *i.e.*

¹ One of the best examples of this habit, which Mr. Darwin does not treat of in detail, is furnished by the not uncommon British wild flower *Chlora perfoliata*, or *Perfoliate Yellow Wort*. The eight bright yellow lobes of its corolla form, when expanded, a remarkably regular star. It opens in the morning and closes early in the afternoon. We have kept cut specimens in water, and found the same flower open and close for many days. Its relative, the *Common Centaury*, does not open its flowers at all except in bright sunshine, a habit shared by other members of the same order, the *Gentianaceæ*.

² *The Power of Movement in Plants*, p. 414.

the act of turning at night. There is, as he tells us, much variety and complexity in the nyctitropic movements of the leaves or cotyledons, or both, of various plants, but the one result common to almost all cases is that the blade is so placed as to stand nearly or quite vertically at night. The aim, so to say, of the plant is to avoid having the *upper* surface of the leaf facing the zenith. It is attained in various ways. Some leaves move so that their apex points upwards, some so that it points downwards; some rotate on their axes so as to present themselves edgewise to the zenith. The leaflets of some compound leaves execute a combined movement of singular beauty. Pairs, especially of leaflets, may so move that their upper surfaces come into close contact: the two lateral leaflets of a trefoil may first bend down, then approach each other until their upper surfaces are in contact; while the central or terminal leaflet rises up, and passing through an angle of 90° to 180° , bends over until it rests on and, face downwards, forms a roof over them. In many species of *Cassia* the horizontally extended leaflets sink down vertically, and, while doing so, rotate on their axes so as to bring their lower surfaces outwards. In *Mimosa pudica*, the well-known *Sensitive Plant*, 'the opposite leaflets come into contact and point towards the apex of the leaf; they thus become neatly imbricated, with their upper surfaces protected.' A simultaneous drawing together of the four pinnæ takes place, so that the imbricated and closed leaflets on each separate pinna form a single bundle. The different appearance of a bush of *Acacia Farnesiana* before and after the nyctitropic movement is very striking. Before the movement the numerous leaflets on each pinna (fourteen pinnæ are represented in Mr. Darwin's illustration as sharing one main petiole, or leaf stalk) are spread out, so that the leaf resembles the frond of a fern; after the movement the 'pinnæ look like bits of dangling string,' the leaflets on each pinna having moved towards its apex, the pinnæ towards the common apex of the whole leaf, while these have also sunk downwards, though the main petiole has risen considerably.¹

The phenomenon is, then, one of very marked character. It is also widely exhibited in the vegetable kingdom, Mr. Darwin's list, which he acknowledges to be very imperfect, including 'sleeping plants' (*i.e.* plants whose leaves sleep) 'in twenty-eight families, in all the great divisions of the Phanerogamic series, and in one Cryptogam.' The sleep of cotyledons,

¹ See for these and many other interesting details *The Power of Movement in Plants*, pp. 280-417.

Mr. Darwin says, 'seems to be a more common phenomenon than that of leaves.'

Mr. Darwin, as is well known, combines a teleological idea with the doctrine of Natural Selection. When the nature of an organ or of a function has been ascertained, he is not satisfied until he has found the *raison d'être* of the organ or function, or, in other words, the benefit which the whole organism derives from it. What, then, he asked himself, is the purpose served by the complex and varied nyctitropic movement in so many plants? What is gained by avoiding the direct aspect of the upper surface of the leaf towards the zenith? The answer that suggested itself—namely, the protection to a certain extent of that surface from the loss of heat by radiation—was only possible since the doctrine of the radiation of heat has been formulated. Yet gardeners have from time immemorial known the great service rendered on cold nights to delicate plants, seedlings, and fruit trees, by a very slight covering, such as a mat, a little straw, or even a net. Mr. Darwin put to Nature herself the question whether nyctitropism has so much effect in preventing radiation as to be sometimes of vital consequence. His method of questioning was to expose, on cold clear nights, plants, some of whose leaves were free to assume the nyctitropic position, some delicately fastened with their upper surfaces facing the zenith. The answer showed that he was right. 'Our experiments,' he says, 'show that leaves thus compelled to remain horizontal at night suffered much more injury from frost than those which were allowed to assume their normal vertical position.'¹ And again, 'the difference in the amount of dew on the pinned-open leaflets and on those which had gone to sleep was generally conspicuous, the latter being absolutely dry, whilst the leaflets which had been horizontal were coated with large beads of dew.' The effect of radiation in causing the deposition of dew is well known, so that it was evident that the leaflets fully exposed to the zenith must have become much cooler than the others.²

Nyctitropism has been removed by modern science from the category of functions common to plants and animals. Plants do not sleep. But in the vegetable kingdom the phe-

¹ *The Power of Movement in Plants*, p. 286.

² *Ibid.* p. 294. Mr. Darwin says, on the same page, that it is not clear 'whether the better protection of the upper surface has been gained from its being more easily injured than the lower surface, or from its injury being a greater evil to the plant;' but he mentions facts which seem to show greater delicacy of constitution in the upper surface.

nomenon in question is not an isolated one having nothing in common with any other. It is one of a variety of movements exhibited by plants, all which movements are declared by modern science to be brought about by the same proximate mechanical means, while many of them are effected by one part of the organism in obedience to an impression received by another. In the way of reduction to unity, the theory propounded by Mr. Darwin in his latest volume would carry us, if it were true—and we are not now disputing it—further still. He believes that, some very exceptional cases apart, all the movements of plants can be reduced to one original movement, of which the rest are modifications. 'As with plants,' he says, 'every character is more or less variable, there seems to be no great difficulty in believing that their circumnutating movements may have been increased or modified in any beneficial manner by the preservation of varying individuals.'¹

Circumnutation is the term employed by Mr. Darwin to denote a movement which, from numerous observations described by him in detail, he concludes to be going on in every growing part of every plant. It consists in the bending of the part successively to all points of the compass, in such a manner that its apex describes irregular elliptical figures, with their longer axes at one time in one direction, at another time in another. The proximate cause of this bending to one side is increased turgescence of the cells on the opposite side.² After germination has commenced, as soon as it is possible to observe the growing parts of the embryo plant, each is seen to be circumnutating. In radicles, one of which projected only $\frac{1}{16}$ of an inch, in hypocotyls, cotyledons, epicotyls,³ from a very early stage of growth, in the stems of small seedlings, in the stems, in the stolons or runners, in the flower stems or peduncles, as well as in the sub-peduncles, and, lastly, in the leaves of older plants Mr. Darwin detected

¹ *The Power of Movement in Plants*, p. 491.

² A very clear practical illustration of the effect of turgescence on one side in causing curvature towards the opposite may be obtained by simply moistening one side of a strip of cardboard. The increased turgescence of the plants' cells is ordinarily followed by growth, but not so in the case of fully grown *pulvini* or cushioned joints, whose temporary turgescence is the means whereby many movements are effected, as, for example, those excited by contact in the Sensitive Plant.

³ Hypocotyl and epicotyl are Mr. Darwin's abbreviations for hypocotyledon and epicotyledon respectively, the former denoting the portion of the stem immediately below and the latter that immediately above the cotyledons. The radicle is 'distinguished from the hypocotyl by the presence of root-hairs and the nature of its covering.'—*The Power of Movement in Plants*, p. 5.

circumnutation.¹ We must here quote a passage which is calculated to clothe with a new interest objects already abounding in interest to the lover of nature.

'If we look . . . at a great acacia tree, we may feel assured that every one of the innumerable growing shoots is continually describing small ellipses; as is each petiole, sub-petiole, and leaflet. . . . The flower peduncles are likewise continually circumnuting. If we could look beneath the ground, and our eyes had the power of a microscope, we should see the tip of each rootlet endeavouring to sweep small ellipses or circles, as far as the pressure of the surrounding earth permitted. All this astonishing amount of movement has been going on year after year since the time when, as a seedling, the tree first emerged from the ground.'²

The reader who desires to learn Mr. Darwin's ingenious methods of observation must be referred to the scientist's own pages; and, in regard to the direct benefit effected by circumnutation, we can now do no more than mention the assistance which it renders to the radicle in penetrating the ground, and in entering 'any lateral or oblique fissure in the earth, or a burrow made by an earth worm or larva';³ to the arched hypocotyl or epicotyl in breaking upward through the ground;⁴ to stolons or runners in 'passing between and over surrounding obstacles';⁵ and to the stems of climbing plants in finding their supports. We do not find stated by Mr. Darwin any direct benefit obtained by the circumnutation of leaves, and if there be none, this fact, perhaps, lends some support to his theory that circumnutation is most important as forming the groundwork, or, we may say, the raw material, out of which other still more important movements have been developed. Plants are affected in a special manner by

¹ The different parts of flowers, it may be noticed, are not included in this enumeration. Their movements were not observed by Mr. Darwin.—*The Power of Movement in Plants*, p. 226.

² *Ibid.* p. 558.

³ *Ibid.* p. 550.

⁴ In very many plants the part that breaks through the ground is arched. For illustrations of the habit and explanation of its utility see *The Power of Movement in Plants*, chap. ii.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 558. For details see pp. 214-222. We quote the account of one experimental observation of the behaviour of strawberry runners. 'Many long pins were next driven rather close together into the sand, so as to form a crowd in front of the same two thin lateral branches; but these easily wound their way through the crowd. A thick stolon was much delayed in its passage; at one place it was forced to turn at right angles to its former course; at another place it could not pass through the pins, and the hinder part became bowed; it then curved upwards and passed through an opening between the upper part of some pins which happened to diverge; it then descended and finally emerged through the crowd.'—P. 219.

certain influences which, by modifying in various ways the universal circumnutatory movement, which he regards as not acquired for a special purpose, have turned it into purposive movements. In this way he explains, as consistent with the doctrine of evolution, the fact that so many special purposive movements exist.

The example to which Mr. Darwin points first as being 'the simplest case of modified circumnutation is that offered by climbing plants,' in which 'the modification consists in the greatly increased amplitude of the movement' and in its greater regularity. It may be remembered that in a previous volume Mr. Darwin showed the use to twining plants of what he there called 'the continuous bowing movement directed successively to all parts of the compass.' 'When a revolving shoot meets with a support,' he told us, 'its motion is necessarily arrested at the point of contact, but the free projecting part goes on revolving.'¹ In support of the view that the movements of climbing plants consist of modified circumnutation, he urges the fact that when very young 'they move like other seedlings, but as they grow older their movements gradually increase without undergoing any other change.'²

The nyctitropic movements of which Mr. Darwin has given so interesting a description are likewise brought under the head of modified circumnutation. He observes that there is already a periodicity in the circumnutatory movements of plants generally, the leaves, some more, some less, rising a little in the evening and sinking in the morning, and the periodicity being doubtless determined by the daily alternations of light and darkness. From the most insignificant of these movements, he says, a series of gradations can be traced in different plants up to the most pronounced nyctitropism, inasmuch that it is difficult to draw the line between mere circumnutation and nyctitropism.³ From this and other facts Mr. Darwin draws the conclusion that the movement whose purpose he has succeeded in explaining is a modified form of the universal movement that seems a necessary accompaniment of all vegetative growth.

The nyctitropic movement, though dependent upon the alternations of light and darkness, is not, according to Mr.

¹ *The Movements and Habits of Climbing Plants*, p. 15. Second edition. London, 1875.

² *The Power of Movement in Plants*, p. 265.

³ Mr. Darwin draws an arbitrary line, so as to include among sleeping plants those only whose leaves assume at night a position at least 60° above or beneath the horizon.—*Ibid.* p. 317.

Darwin, to be considered as directly *caused* by these alternations, which, to quote his remarkable words, 'merely give notice to the leaves that the period has arrived for them to move in a certain manner.'¹ However this may be, 'the action of light in modifying the periodic movements of leaves' is to be clearly distinguished from movements determined by the *direction* of light, by means of which movements plants or parts of plants place themselves in certain relations to the source of light. The most common of these movements are Heliotropism, or, turning towards the light, and Diaheliotropism, the assumption of a position more or less transversely to the direction of the light; Apheliotropism, the opposite of Heliotropism, being rare.² All these, as well as Geotropism, in virtue of which some parts of plants, as the primary radicle generally, direct themselves towards the centre of the earth, Apogeotropism, the opposite of Geotropism, and Diageotropism, which gives a direction more or less at right angles to the earth's radius and which facilitates the spreading of secondary radicles, are clearly proved examples, Mr. Darwin thinks, of modified circumnutation. It has already been stated that the proximate cause of circumnutation is the increased turgescence of the cells on one side, and it should now be added that the same proximate cause is assigned for all the other movements named above. It may perhaps be well to quote here a few lines from Mr. Darwin:—

'When light strikes one side of a plant, or light changes into darkness, or when gravitation acts upon a displaced part, the plant is enabled in some unknown manner to increase the always varying turgescence of the cells on one side; so that the ordinary circumnutation movement is modified, and the part bends either to or from the exciting cause; or it may occupy a new position, as in the so-called sleep of leaves.'³

There is yet another very interesting subject on which Mr. Darwin's observations have thrown much new light, the transmission from one part of a plant to another of the influence which sets on foot, or, as it were, gives the signal for, many of these movements. Most readers will be astonished to find how widely this power of transmission prevails. It begins with the first stage of plant life. No sooner has the radicle protruded from the germinating seed than it is acted

¹ *The Power of Movement in Plants*, p. 407.

² Some tendrils are apheliotropic and their tips crawl into dark crevice.—*Ibid.* p. 489.

³ *Ibid.* pp 547, 548.

upon by geotropism. But it is only the tip of the radicle that is sensitive¹ to gravitation; 'and it is the tip which transmits some influence to the adjoining parts, causing them to bend.'² This same tip of the radicle is sensitive to contact. When it meets an obstacle it causes the adjoining parts to bend away.³ This is the more remarkable because these parts are acted upon by contact in an opposite manner, so that they bend *towards* an object. It will be obvious that this endowment of the radicle enables it to steer clear of an obstacle, when geotropism will at once guide it downwards, while the peculiar endowment of the adjoining parts prevents the deviation from becoming unnecessarily great. In the same wonderful organ is localized also a sensitiveness to moisture.⁴ Other illustrations of localised sensitiveness might be given from Mr. Darwin's volume, though, except as regards the sensitiveness of the tips of some cotyledons to contact and to light, and the consequent transmission of an influence to the tender stem,⁵ he has not treated this part of the subject in such detail as he has the sensitiveness of the tip of the radicle.

In the fact that certain parts of the plant organism receive impressions, and that the effect of such impressions is transmitted to other parts, it is impossible not to see another remarkable link of connexion between the vegetable and animal kingdoms. The sensitiveness of the plant may even exceed that of the organs of sensation in animals, at any rate that of the human retina. 'A difference in the illumination of the two sides of the cotyledons of *Phalaris*, which could not be distinguished by the human eye, sufficed to cause them to bend.'⁶ Plants do not indeed 'possess nerves or a central nervous system;' but Mr. Darwin infers that 'such structures serve only for the more perfect transmission of impressions, and for the more complete intercommunication of the several parts.'⁷ An interesting line of scientific inquiry is here suggested, which will doubtless engage the attention of investigators; namely, what element of matter, or what form of energy, is concerned in the transmission of influence in plants, and whether it is merely a more complicated organization of the same means that produces a similar effect in animals. But suppose these questions solved, we shall be as far as ever from an answer to the question how sensory

¹ 'A part or organ may be called sensitive when its irritation excites movement in an adjoining part.'—*The Power of Movement in Plants*, p. 191.

² *Ibid.* p. 548.

³ *Ibid.* p. 198.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 180 *seq.*

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 126 *seq.* and p. 484 *seq.*

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 487. See for the details p. 455.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 572.

impressions result in consciousness. Sensitiveness and consciousness are two very different things. The one is exhibited in the telegraphic instrument, the other is confined to the operator.

To conclude: We have seen that science has unravelled many of the secret operations of what we call Nature, and has frequently found a bond of unity in many diverse phenomena. But at the end of every line of investigation which she follows she arrives at length at that which baffles scrutiny. We have only to turn to the most recent work published by the most famous of the scientists of our generation, perhaps of several generations, for new testimony to the truth of this statement. Thus, with regard to the (supposed) fundamental movement of circumnutation, we read, 'Why every part of a plant, whilst it is growing, and in some cases after growth has ceased,¹ should have its cells rendered more turgescer, and its cell-walls more extensile, first on one side and then on another, thus inducing circumnutation, is not known.'² Then, assuming the truth of Mr. Darwin's theory, that various external forces have modified this single original movement in the manner that he describes, if we ask how these forces exert their special influences, the answer is still a confession of ignorance. 'In what manner light, gravitation, &c., act on the cells is not known.'³ With regard to other movements, as those of the Sensitive Plant when touched, which Mr. Darwin does not believe to depend on modified circumnutation, science is equally at a loss. 'Why a touch, slight pressure, or any other irritant, such as electricity, heat, or the absorption of animal matter, should modify the turgescence of the affected cells in such a manner as to cause movement we do not know.'⁴ Along with these facts we recall to mind that science has not yet formulated explanations of either of the two foundation principles of the theory of evolution; namely, the transmission of habit from an organism to its descendants and the rise of variations. Even in his latest volume Mr. Darwin tells us that the cause of most variations is unknown.⁵ Summarily, science points to unity, but science provides no explanation of the origin of energy, nor of the action of its subtler forms on living organisms, nor of the stability and regularity of the laws under which it is exhibited to us, nor of the power of variation whereby the organic forms through

¹ The movements 'after growth has ceased' are those of organs provided with pulvini.

² *The Power of Movement in Plants*, p. 546.

³ *Ibid.* p. 569.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 571.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 492.

which life is manifested accommodate themselves to changing circumstances. The theist may claim to assert that his ultimate principle is necessary as the complement of science. If evolution is a scientific truth he can accept it and yet say, 'It is God that made us and not we ourselves.' . . . 'He upholdeth all things by the word of His power.' And, to close with a reference to the latest addition to the arguments for evolution, the theist will see no more danger to his crowning principle in the assertion that the complex nyctitropic or other movements of plants are developed out of an almost purposeless and irregular circumnutation than in the assertion that, when 'man goeth forth to his work and to his labour until the evening,' he is exhibiting a development of the irregular and comparatively purposeless movements of his infancy.

ART. VI.—THE LETTERS OF POPE GREGORY I.

Gregory the Great. By the Rev. J. BARMBY, B.D., Vicar of Pittington, late Principal of Bishop Hatfield Hall, Durham, and formerly Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. (London, 1879.)

WE have called attention to the light thrown by the letters and despatches of Cassiodorus on the political and social life of Italy, in its details and daily course, when the German invaders first appeared there as masters and settlers, and the struggle began, in numberless and varied points all over the peninsula, between their customs and spirit and the strong but damaged fabric of Roman civilization. The collection of Cassiodorus shows this, under the wise and generally benignant policy of Theodoric, and when the forces and habits which had for centuries governed life under the Empire, though for the moment surprised and shaken, had in no way lost their sway on the imagination and faith of the population. The campaigns of Belisarius and Narses seemed to show what power was still left in the Roman Empire. These great captains, with armies recruited from the steppes of Scythia and the Isaurian highlands, tore the great prize of the Italian cities and provinces out of the obstinate grip of the Germans, and for a few years held it fast. But there was nothing solid in the deliverance. It was not to restore the dominion of the world to

Rome and Italy, but to recover a lost jewel for the crown worn by Greeks at Constantinople. Belisarius won back the great prefecture of Italy, as he had won back the great prefecture opposite—of Africa; both of them territories necessary to a power which, like that of Constantinople, meant to command the Mediterranean. But all this was transient. That which was to be the long fate of Italy had begun. The condition of things mirrored in the letters of Cassiodorus was continued and fixed in a permanent and aggravated form under the dominion of the Lombards. Never more for centuries was she to shake off her northern masters—

‘Per servir sempre, o vincitrice, o vinta.’

But besides the state papers of Cassiodorus there is another series, really public ones even when addressed to individuals, which is of the highest importance to the knowledge of those critical times, when the old world was slowly passing into the modern world. These are the letters of the Popes. These letters, in their genuine and in their forged form, are the foundation of the Canon Law; and to the end of the fifth century, those genuine ones which have come down to us are almost exclusively of theological or ecclesiastical interest. But from the time of Pope Gelasius (492–496), that is, from the time of the first establishment of the northern foreigners in Italy, these letters assume a business-like character as well. They began, as a matter of course, whether or not the writer was personally a remarkable man, to be copied, as public records, into registers in the Roman Chancery (*scrinium*), and preserved in the archives of the Lateran.¹ They have been frequently made into collections with varying objects and varying completeness; they have been recently calendared with admirable care by Jaffé, Pothast, and P. Ewald; but they have yet to be fully gathered together, arranged and critically edited with due knowledge and skill. When this is done they will present a picture of the daily goings on, the daily purposes and conflicts, the daily troubles and difficulties of Italian life, as important though, perhaps, not so varied as the papers of Cassiodorus. Among these documents stands out pre-eminently the ‘Registrum,’ or letter-book, of Gregory the Great (590–604).

A glance at this collection is sufficient to show that it was something new, in its magnitude and its variety of subjects. If any one will compare with it, in Jaffé’s book, the abstracts

¹ Ewald in *Neues Archiv*, vol. v. p. 509. (*Liber Diurnus*, ed. De Rozière, pp. ix., xxv.)

of the letters of Leo, of Gelasius, of Vigilius, of the first and second Pelagius, some of the busiest among Gregory's predecessors, the difference will be seen. The letters are much fewer; and they relate mainly to the internal concerns of the Church, as a religious society. This is especially the case with the largest and most important collection, that of the letters of Pope Leo. But when we come to Gregory's *Registrum*, the theological element, though not absent, contracts itself into a much smaller space. Matters of Church government and discipline, of social morality and order, are prominent. But secular questions in great variety, such as might engage the attention of a conscientious and just landlord, a vigilant and beneficent head of a civil department, or a public-spirited and large-hearted minister, occupy even more space in it, and show how large a part the Pope was beginning to take in the political and temporal business of Italy. It is this preponderance of administrative activity which gives a character to the letters of Gregory the Great, and makes them so important in illustrating the history of his age and country. But the collection has a further interest. The history of forsaken and helpless Italy, abandoned by the Empire to which it had given birth, and, after having been for ages the flower and glory of the world, the chosen and privileged home of luxury and power, delivered over defenceless to the barbarians, to be dealt with at their insolent pleasure, is perhaps the most pathetic spectacle to be found in history of a fallen nation; and the piercing and expressive sense of this degradation thrills through every line of Gregory's letters.¹ We see in them the evidence of one of those times of apparent chaos, when the power and hope of remedy, of repair, of resource, seem exhausted among men. But those times of chaos are only apparent; there is always something forming, organizing itself, growing under them. And the special interest of Gregory's letters is that, amid the desolations of Italy and these wails of despair, in this record of lamentation and mourning and woe, they exhibit in the clearest and most instructive way the nascent Papacy of the middle ages: the early steps by which the Primacy of S. Leo, the head of the hierarchy of the early times, *Primus inter pares* among the great Patriarchs of the

¹ 'We,' writes Gregory in his earliest letters, 'who abroad meet everywhere the stab of the foeman's sword, at home have to face the mutiny of our defenders;' 'you,' contrasting the position of his brother Patriarch at Constantinople, 'who stand afar off from the confusion of tribulation, which we suffer in this land.'—Ep. i. 3, 4. See in his Homilies on Ezekiel, ii. 6. 22-24, on the ruin of the 'Lady of the World,' '*Mundi Domina*.'

undivided Church, developed into the administrative all-controlling monarchy of Gregory VII., Innocent III., and Boniface VIII. And they show not only the steps by which it took shape and became established; they show it was a necessary and inevitable consequence of the conditions of the time.

The events of the sixth century had, on the whole, consolidated the Empire in the East. But in the West these events had broken up society, and left it to re-form itself round new centres of authority. And they had left Italy, especially, the most disorganized province of the Empire. Nobody knew to whom it belonged. In Gaul, in Spain, in Africa, in Britain, there had been ruin and change; but no one doubted who was master. Not so in Italy. There had been a Teutonic kingdom in Italy, taking the place of the Latin rule. But it had passed away, and at the end of the century the 'times of the Goths'¹ were only talked of with other things of the past. And now, who ruled Italy? The great Cæsar far away never ceased, of course, to claim its allegiance; but his interest in it was like the interest of the present Ottomans in Arabia and Egypt, and his hold on it was of the same kind. He had garrisons in Ravenna, in Rome, in Naples; certain formal points of etiquette towards him were exacted or kept up by custom, more or less regularly; when he could, he levied money; but the country, as a whole, was left to itself. The Lombards—so we call them for convenience, though the name was yet unknown, and the Langobardi and Lombards were as different from one another as the Franks and the French—had come down in strength, and shown their purpose to remain. They had seized a number of important cities, and went on, as opportunity offered, to threaten and attempt others. But they were balancing between a centralized kingship and their primitive arrangement of independent 'dukedom'; and they had not yet made up their minds to exchange the roving and buccaneering habits of a predatory horde for the settled life and ease to which their conquests invited them, but which also involved the restraints which necessarily fall on dwellers in cities. At Pavia and Monza they were beginning to build churches and palaces; meanwhile, their bands were still wandering over Italy, wasting farms, surprising towns, cutting off heads, or driving their captives in leash, 'like dogs,' under the walls of Rome.² The Exarch and his

¹ Greg. *Dialogues*, passim; Ep. iv. 19.

² See Ep. ii. 46 (a. 592); Ep. v. 40 (595): 'Ita ut oculis meis cernerem Romanos more canum in collis funibus ligatos, qui ad Franciam ducebantur venales.'

master were, not strong enough to check or punish them ; the Lombards were not strong enough to chase the Exarch from Ravenna, or the Latin garrison from Rome. They fixed themselves in centres of devastation at Spoleto or Benevento ; not masters themselves, but allowing no one else to be master. The municipalities of Italy had long been sinking under the weight of the taxes, and now they knew that there was no government to care for them or protect them. Where they were not ruined they yielded more and more to that tendency to isolation, which has ever since been so marked a feature in Italian civil life. There was nothing to bind them to a common country, where the representatives of the central authority came only to fleece and oppress them. Crowds of proprietors and town councillors pressed into the clergy or into the monasteries, not from love of a religious life, but to escape the responsibilities of citizens ; and order after order had to be issued by the authorities, both of the Church and of the State, that such candidates were to be rigorously excluded, unless it was quite clear that their impoverished and burdened fellow-citizens had no claim on them, either in respect of the obligations of office, or their share of the public taxes. Rome itself was as much perplexed as the rest of Italy as to whom it belonged : whether the feeble and often mutinous garrison which the Emperor kept there meant that he cared little about maintaining it in its old dignity ; whether the presence of an imperial officer, and the infrequent and chiefly complimentary communications which passed between the old and new Rome, signified anything more than the unwillingness of a court to give up nominal claims ; whether the withdrawal of all substantial honours and substantial assistance did not leave Rome free to think exclusively of its own interests ; whether it was worth while, or whether the Emperor had any right, to keep up any tie at all between Rome and a distant and alien government, a government in the hands of despised and detested Greeks. Rome, with its immense pretensions and wonderful memories, could neither yield to the Lombard, nor keep him at bay, nor render any cheerful and honest allegiance to Cæsars who had despoiled her of that by which alone the Cæsars had become great.

Constantine's policy has been extolled for its wisdom in transplanting the seat of empire from the Tiber to the Bosphorus. Byzantium, in such an empire as that of the Cæsars had become, was more central than Rome ; and for commerce, for defence, for the beauty and magnificence of a capital, it was as much above the old seat of the Republic, as it was

more convenient for the transaction of business, for administration, government and conquest. Rome was an accidental site; no one would have chosen it as a capital for its own sake among the cities of Italy. Constantinople was one deliberately selected by a far-sighted wisdom, out of all that the Empire had to offer. But Constantine made one oversight; at least he made one mistake, and it was to the objects of his policy and the unity of the empire a fatal one. He forgot, when he transferred the throne of Augustus to Byzantium, that he left behind him at Rome, consecrated and justified by the matchless history of a thousand years, jealousies which were unappeasable, and hatreds that nothing could wear out. When he erected a new capital he ought to have destroyed the old one, and passed the ploughshare over it, as Totila the Goth meant to do. In those days it would not have been impossible if he had had the courage. 'Like Thebes, or Babylon, or Carthage,' writes Gibbon, 'the name of Rome might have been erased from the earth, if the city had not been animated by a vital principle, which again restored her to honour and dominion.' But the sanctity of Christian Rome was not greater than that of Jerusalem, and Constantinople had been made to take precedence of Jerusalem; and Constantine, if he were to perfect his work, should have given to the population of Rome, to its nobility, to its clergy, new homes and new interests, and left its ruins to the advancing fevers of the Campagna. At the beginning of the fourth century, even the Bishop of Rome would hardly have been an insuperable obstacle to the completeness of the change. Whether the world would have been a gainer by such a unity of empire is another question, and one on which it is idle to speculate. But it is as certain as anything can be, that by leaving Rome standing, in its decayed majesty and unabated pretensions, Constantine made inevitable one great calamity of European history, the disruption and the antipathies of East and West; and by leaving on the spot, as the sole representative of those Imperial ideas and claims which never died at Rome, one who could invest them with a new and diviner sanctity, he also made inevitable the position, the pretensions, and the theocratic monarchy, of the Popes.

For in the misery and confusion to which Italy had been abandoned, the one survival of purpose and governing capacity was in the Roman Church. Great by the necessities of the case; great by religious tradition; great by political position; great by the divisions of the Church, which needed an arbiter, and sought the most highly placed; great by in-

creasing pretensions readily made and readily or lightly allowed; great equally in the name of the Apostles and of the Cæsars, the Roman Church, amid all the accumulations of misfortune which fell on the city, only grew stronger and greater by the destruction of every rival authority within it. In this way the discrowning of the 'Lady of Kingdoms,' in favour of her eastern rival, had saved the Roman Church. In this way the ravages of Alaric and Genseric had rendered more conspicuous the strength of that institution which ruled with undiminished loftiness amid the tremendous ruin which they had made. The temper, the obstinacy, the 'high stomach' of the old senate had passed into the clergy who surrounded the Roman Patriarch at the Lateran, or before the tombs of the Apostles. With the exception of S. Leo, the early Popes have not much distinctness of personal character; but they were the heads, the representatives, the organs of a body which had inherited and sedulously cherished all that was left of Roman firmness, of Roman sense of dignity, and of Roman traditions of policy and action. They kept it all, undismayed and unflinching, till the evil day came when, except among them, Roman strength, Roman organization, Roman tenacity had perished. Then, among these ecclesiastics and their chiefs, and these only, was to be found an intelligent estimate of the difficulties of the time, a clear perception and steady pursuit of objects and aims, the unshaken faith in a great cause, courage, counsel, sympathy, public spirit; allegiance, always professed, and often really paid, through all disappointments, to justice and purity; the conviction that in the end, though perhaps not here, right must triumph, and wrong meet its reward. In a blind and fainting world, given over to violence, and cut loose from all order and law, *immensa mortalitatis vastitas*,¹ we can hardly imagine now what it must have been to have had such a stay to lean upon, such a refuge to fly to for comfort, protection, guidance. It is not wonderful that the claims of the Roman Church to govern men were magnified. It is not wonderful that they were allowed. For who was there to do it better?

And when all this came to be represented, not by average men, but by one in whom all its characteristic features were embodied in a high degree, the effect, not merely at the moment, but permanently, was greatly increased. And this was what happened when Gregory became Pope. In the public history of the time, as a man in high place, he stands

¹ Ep. xiii. 42.

in the sharpest contrast to every one round him. And he stands in almost as sharp a contrast to almost all his predecessors. We know a great deal more about him than about most of them; but the reason probably is that he did more, and there was more to preserve about him.

Of this remarkable person we do not pretend in this paper to give an account. Besides being a Pope and a public man, he was a theologian and a Church reformer, to whose influence and to whose ideas the public worship of the West owes in a great degree its forms, its language, and its music. He leads the van of the writers and doctors of the middle age. There is a great gulf between him and S. Augustine; but he was next to S. Augustine as its teacher. His works, the *Dialogues*, the *Moralia on Job*, the *Homilies on Ezekiel*, the *Rule of the Pastoral Care*, stand second in mediæval libraries only to the works of S. Augustine. But of all this we shall say nothing. In truth, an adequate book on Gregory the Great, to whom England and the English race owe so much, would fill an obvious void in our literature. Mr. Barmby, in his little volume recently published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, tells the story with care and feeling. The chapter about him in Dean Milman's *Latin Christianity* is picturesque and comprehensive. There is a more elaborate work in German by Lau.¹ But the whole subject, in its various relations, is still an open one. The edition of Gregory's *Registrum*, promised by the editors of the new series of the *Monumenta Germaniæ*,² and now on the eve of publication, may, when it appears, tempt some scholar to undertake the task.

Gregory, above all things, was a Roman of the Romans. His family was noble and rich, and counted a Pope among its members two or three generations back. He had grown up with the belief that the world had never produced any race of men equal to Romans; that, in spite of all their crimes and all their degradation, they still remained the first and noblest people on the earth; they were the deposed lords of mankind, justly abiding their punishment, but none the less high above the instruments of their chastisement, the barbarians and slaves who had risen in rebellion against them, in their sense of what was worthy of men, and in their capacity to rule men. Churchman as he is, the first and greatest of his order, yet the old proud word of Rome, which even in the

¹ *Gregor. I. der Grosse*. G. J. T. Lau: Leips. 1845. See also Hegel, *Städteverfassung von Italien*, I. ii. 1.

² *Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum*. Hannover. 1878, p. 524.

style of this time had survived imperialism, *Respublica*, name and thing, the sum of secular interests, with all their associations and all their duties, is as often in his mouth as it was in the mouth of Cicero; as it might have been in the mouth of a statesman, if there had been one in the West equal to the emergency. The Greeks he hated and scorned. He disdained to learn their language, though it must have been as common in Rome as French is in London, and though the greatest and most venerable portion of Christian literature was Greek. He acquitted himself with becoming dignity and self-respect, when he had to be civil to the great authorities of the Empire, who were Greek; but national antipathy edged his dislike and his sarcasm when he found himself in controversy with a Patriarch of Constantinople, or protesting against an Imperial edict. As for the German 'long-bearded' barbarians, the Lombards (as we call them by anticipation, for Gregory knew not the softened name), the faithless ruffians who lorded it over a superior race, he felt nothing but indignant loathing. It was a popular belief, alluded to in Popes' letters long after Gregory, that the Lombards were physically unclean and offensive; they certainly were so to all his moral instincts; they stank in his nostrils. Yet the barbarians, in their own land and at a distance, excited his interest, his compassion, his desire to be their benefactor, lawgiver, and apostle. Gregory is the one Pope of that time who shows the old Roman yearning for new realms to subject to the rule and order of Rome. It was good for the world that the limit of barbarism should be narrowed, and glorious for the Master whom he served; and he sent forth Augustine and Mellitus to Britain, as the Cæsars sent forth Suetonius and Agricola. There is no one who can with such justice be said to have been *Ultimus Romanorum*. He was one of the old stock by blood, by character, by his faults and his greatness; and no one of the same type and combination of qualities appears after him.

He was a man of his time. His sincere and fervent religion was deeply affected by the superstitions of his age. He was easily credulous of miracles, and encouraged credulity round him. He believed that there was virtue in filings from the Apostles' chains, and bits of rag which had been passed over their tombs; and he sent such things as presents to distinguished officers and barbarian kings.¹ It is to be feared that he was not always scrupulous in the means which he took

¹ Paul. Diac., *Vit. Greg.*, c. 24; Ep. i. 30; iii. 33.

to make others believe what he himself believed, and held to be most important and sacred. If the stories told by his biographers are true,¹ he must sometimes have stooped to a conjurer's trick to convince a gainsayer. He was, as was to be expected, peremptory and stern in discipline; he was sometimes severe and harsh. He was certainly severe and unsparing to himself. During the whole of his active life, he was never free from bodily suffering, brought on probably by his austerities; unable from pain to stand or to sit, he transacted business, dictated his letters, composed his religious treatises, and gave his instructions in music, condemned by his infirmities to the confinement of his couch.² Years after his death they still showed in the Lateran palace the bed on which he used to lie while giving his lessons in chanting to his choir school, and the whip (*flagellum*) with which 'he used to threaten his boys' during the practice.³ The example of S. Benedict, the great reformer of religious life in Italy in the sixth century, had profoundly impressed him. In contrast with the contemplative asceticism of the East, and beyond mere passive privations of appetite, Benedict of Nursia had introduced into his model of Christian perfection, as a primary and indispensable obligation, the characteristic idea of severe manual labour, chiefly in connection with the soil. It was a familiar idea to one belonging to the labouring population of central Italy, the descendants of the toil-hardened Sabine and Marsian farmers. It gave a thoroughly Latin colour and direction to monasticism, and long determined its course in the West; and to Gregory, as to many of his contemporaries, it made the monastic profession a new reality, both in its form of self-denial, and in its habits of practical utility and indefatigable labour.

He was a Roman in his sternness and determination, but he was an Italian in his tenderness, and he was also an Italian in his humour. His letters break out continually into a burst of grave playfulness, as of a man who, suffering himself, and with much suffering round him, could not help being amused by what was grotesque and odd among the serious things with which he had to deal. His famous string of puns, about the English slaves, one following another as they do in a punster's happy moment, is connected with one of his most eventful resolutions, the mission to England. He mingled

¹ Paul. Diac. c. 23.

² Paul. Diac. c. 15; and his letters, *passim*.

³ Joan. Diac. ii. 6 (882). 'Sein Wille war stark genug, eine ganze Welt vom Krankenbette aus zu regieren.'—Hegel, i. 164; vide Ep. ix. 123.

his very southern exuberance of complaint, in moments of distress and anxiety, and the Scriptural phrases in which, after the fashion of the time, he expressed it, with rough jokes against himself. 'Behold,' he writes to the Emperor's sister, lamenting his change of life and occupations when he was made Pope, 'behold, the Most Serene Lord, the Emperor, has bidden a monkey to become a lion. He may order the monkey to be called a lion, but even his orders cannot make him one.'¹ So he writes to a friend on the same occasion: 'It is all very well to make the name the likeness of the thing, and to turn neat sentences and pretty speeches in your letters, and to call a monkey a lion; but it is just the same thing as we do when we call mangy puppies pards or tigers.'² The vein of pleasantry, generally in the form of oburgation, which comes out in his letters, is something of the same kind as the humour of Pio Nono, and, like his, is sometimes savage. His favourite, Peter the Subdeacon, his agent in Sicily and the manager of the great Church estates, trusted as he was, does not come off without an occasional touch of his master's sarcasm.³ 'I am very much obliged to your solicitude about the order which I gave you to retransmit my brother's money, and which you have as entirely committed to oblivion as if it had been something said about the meanest of your own slaves. Now, at any rate, will—I cannot say your *Experience*, but—your *Negligence* be good enough to fulfil it.' In another long letter of separate directions, Peter is reminded, partly in jest and a good deal in earnest, of his duties:—

'I hear from Abbot Marinianus that the building in the Prætorian Monastery is not yet half done: what shall I say to this, but extol the ardour of your *Experience*? I hear, too, that you are quite aware that certain property and several farms really belong to other people, but that through the representations or the fear of some one or other you are afraid to restore them. If you were really a Christian, you would fear God's judgment more than men's tattle. Now, mind what I say, for I am always telling you about this . . . Further, you have sent me a wretched hack, and five good donkeys. The hack I cannot ride, he is such a brute: and the animals that are good I cannot mount, because they are donkeys. So if you wish to make me content, be so good as to send me something more suitable.'⁴

His humour and his way of rallying his friends when not quite satisfied with them pass sometimes into half-conscious irony, and deepen into sarcasm when he was vexed or irritated. There was an easy-going bishop of Salona, Natalis,

¹ Ep. i. 5.² Ep. i. 6.³ Ep. i. 44.⁴ Ep. ii. 32.

towards whom Gregory felt kindly, though he disapproved of his ways and had rebuked him.¹ The bishop excused himself. He was charged with being too fond of conviviality: but had not Abraham made a feast and received angels, and had not Isaac enjoyed his venison before he blessed his son? Feasts promoted kindness and charity, and S. Paul had said, 'Let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth.' It was true he was not a reader, but his 'tribulations' left him no time. Gregory's grave letter in answer is inimitable. He accepts the argument as all serious, and solemnly points out that if Natalis *had* received angels, there was nothing more to be said; that as to Isaac's venison, it had an allegorical meaning, and that *if* the good things which Natalis enjoyed were, according to this meaning, the study of the Divine Scriptures, then Gregory could not blame his love of good cheer. So feasts promoted charity, if people did not backbite and laugh at their absent neighbours in them, and gossip about worldly trifles: 'if this is your way in your feasts, I own that you are masters for those who fast.' And in the same strain he goes on at length 'answering the fool according to his folly.' But there are occasions when his irony becomes fierce. This was especially provoked by his great brother at Constantinople, John the Faster. 'Did he carry his abstinence so far,' he asks in one of these letters, 'as to feel bound to abstain even from telling the truth?'² It is curious to read in the mouth

¹ Ep. ii. 52.

² 'Gregory to John, Bishop of Constantinople.—The subject itself is a reason for writing, but charity moves me besides: for I have written once and again to my most holy brother, Lord John, and have not had his answer. Some secular person or other addressed me in his name; but if they were his letters, I was not awake, for what I found in them was something very different from what I believed of him. For I had written about the most reverend John the Priest, and about the question of the Isaurian monks, one of whom, himself a priest, had been beaten with rods in your Church; and the answer came back, in the name of your most holy Fraternity, that you knew not what I was writing about. I was amazed and puzzled at this answer, for I thought to myself, if he speaks the truth, what can be worse than that such things should be done, and that he who is on the spot should not know of them? What can be the shepherd's excuse if the wolf eats the sheep and the shepherd not know it? But if your holiness knew of it, and why I wrote, and answered, "I do not know," what shall I reply on my part, seeing the Scripture saith, "the mouth which lieth, slayeth the soul"? I beseech you, most holy brother, has that abstinence of yours, which is so great, come to this point, that you would deny and hide to your brother what you know to be the case? Would it not have been better that flesh should have entered into that mouth to be eaten, than that out of it should have come the untrue word to deceive a neighbour . . . But God forbid that I should think anything of the sort of your most holy heart. The letter had your name prefixed,

of a Roman Pontiff, himself a monk and an ascetic, sarcasms against the alleged show of asceticism, as bitter and truculent as those with which we are familiar in the Puritan controversialists.¹

Gregory, in truth, was an old-fashioned Roman in his deep dislike of anything Greek. He felt towards all Greeks and all that belonged to them as Juvenal did; as Englishmen of the last century felt towards everything French. The brutality of the barbarians shocked and alarmed as well as disgusted him, but he had the feeling of superior strength in the mingled contempt and loathing which he felt for the 'impostures' of the Greeks. 'Nothing in any of the Pope's family,' says his biographer, 'from the least to the greatest, showed barbarian ways, either in speech or dress; but the genuine Latin spirit, in *toga* or *trabea* (the dress of consuls or knights), after the old Roman fashion, occupied its own Latium in the very Latial palace.' But he goes on to add, after saying how philosophy and wisdom abounded in the palace, that 'the only thing wanting was the interpreter's knowledge of two languages, the Cecropian maiden having of late given herself to the task of defending juggling frauds.'² His letters curiously bear out the statement. He seems rather to pride himself on his ignorance of Greek; he does not want to know it.³ He never heard of so famous a heretic as Eudoxius, because he could not find him in Philastrius and Augustine, and the Latin translation of Epiphanius.⁴ He knew nothing of the Greek Church historians, and would have nothing to do with them; and learnt at last to his surprise from the Bishop of Alexandria who Eudoxius was, against whom the mighty Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus had written, 'against whom our heroes have cast so many darts.'⁵ He accuses Greek monks of forgery but I do not think it was yours. I wrote to the most blessed man, Lord John, but I believe the answer came from some young fellow of your household, who has learned nothing yet of God, who knows nothing of the bowels of love, who is accused on all hands of shameful crimes and of forging wills, who fears not God, nor regards man.'—Ep. iii. 53.

¹ For instance, in a letter to the Emperor—'Dum nos (the clergy) *competentia nobis relinquimus, et nobis incompetentia cogitamus, peccata nostra barbaricis viribus sociamus, et culpa nostra hostium gladios excuit, quæ R. P. vires gravat. Quid autem dicturi sumus . . . qui quod per linguam prædicamus, per exempla destruimus? Ossa jejuniis atteruntur, et mente turgemus. Corpus despectis vestibus tegitur, et elatione cordis purpuram superamus. Jacemus in cinere, et excelsa despiciamus. Doctores humilium, duces superbiæ, ovina facie lupinos dentes abscondimus.*'—Ep. v. 20.

² Jo. Diac. ii. 13, 14. He had no one at C. P. to translate from Latin into Greek.—Ep. vi. 30.

³ Ep. vii. 32.

⁴ Ep. vii. 4, 34.

⁵ Ep. viii. 30.

VOL. XII.—NO. XXIII.

L

ing false relics.¹ He would not answer a lady's letter 'because, being a Latin, she had written to him in Greek.'² He questions Greek references to the council of Ephesus, and will not trust their copies.³ 'The Roman editions (*codices*) are much more faithful than the Greek ones; for' (he is writing to a Greek friend) 'we have not your wit, but neither have we your cheating tricks (*imposturas*).'⁴ It is clear how great was the Latin ignorance about the questions debated in the East; how limited was the Latin power to master them; and how great the confusion, the jealous animosities, and the misunderstandings caused by this loss of hold on Greek language and thought.

Gregory was a man of the time, as we all are; but what is more distinctive is that he was also eminently a man above his time. In days of lawless violence, his governing and inspiring idea was the idea of justice. Like S. Ambrose, he had been a Roman magistrate;⁴ and he carried the point of honour set by the best class of Roman magistrates, as to integrity and justice, into his office of Christian bishop. In his government of the Church, his leading purpose was to put down corruption, to take care that all its officers did their duty, to maintain serious discipline both in life and function, to keep before men's minds the reasons why they were religious. In the special colour and character of his policy, he was far above the temptation to splendour and show, so often felt in high places, and nowhere more than in his. With a full sense of the greatness of his place and duty, he hated ostentation in others, and shrank from it himself. The points on which he insisted and set his heart were points of practical usefulness: keeping churches and buildings in repair instead of erecting new and grand ones;⁵ regulating and establishing the service, the order, the music of the public worship of the Church; setting on foot a difficult and serious mission, like Augustine's to England. Further, he was the one patriot in Italy: the one man, in a conspicuous position, who took a true measure of the calamities and dishonour of his native land, and whose heart was pierced by them; the one man who was continually divided between pity and indignation towards men and lowly resignation beneath the scourge of God, at the thought that Italy should no longer belong to the Italians; the one man who, in the utter absence of any

¹ Ep. iv. 30.² Ep. iv. 32.³ Ep. vi. 14.⁴ He had been *Prætor urbanus*.—Ep. iv. 2.⁵ 'Qui omni vite suæ tempore sicut novas basilicas minime fabricarat, ita nimirum fabricatarum veterum sarta tecta cum summo studio annualiter reparabat.'—Joan. Diac. iv. 68; cf. ii. 1, and Paul. Diac. c. 16.

human hope, tried to make the best of a condition which he felt to be miserable, and who, as God had denied deliverance, sought with all his might, for the sake of his suffering countrymen, to win over the barbarian oppressors to counsels and habits of peace. His *Registrum* furnishes a store of curious and interesting illustrations of these points. We propose to give some specimens.

The Roman Church, when Gregory became Pope, had become the proprietor of a great 'Patrimony.' Its head was the landlord of vast estates on the mainland, in Gaul, and especially in fertile, and for the present well-guarded, Sicily; and the revenues of these estates, particularly of the corn-growing farms of Sicily, fed a large portion of the population of impoverished Rome.¹ The property was managed by local agents, and by semi-ecclesiastical officers, *sub-deacons*, sent from Rome; and the *massæ* or farms, with the tenants and labourers attached to them, were leased to farmers (*conductores*), who were responsible for the rents in money or kind. In a disorganized time like the sixth century, it may be imagined how fraud and wrong had it their own way among the poor tenants of a distant absentee landlord; and how in this case fraud and wrong were veiled under the pretence of the interests of the Church. Gregory's Roman love of justice, and Christian sympathy for the poor, rose up together against these abuses. He at once set to work to check and correct them. Among his first orders were peremptory instructions to the manager of the Sicilian estates, Peter the sub-deacon, to look into the whole subject, to give up all unjust claims and profits on behalf of the Church, and to insist on justice everywhere.²

'The letter of instructions which I sent you when you were proceeding to Sicily is to be repeatedly consulted by you, so that the greatest care may be taken that the Bishops do not interfere in secular matters, except so far as they are obliged to do so in order to protect the poor. But, as to the instructions in the letter about monks and clerics, I think that for the present things had best be let alone; only in attending to this, your Experience will remember to carry out as much as can be fulfilled of what you know to be my wish. Further, it has come to my knowledge, that for the ten years, from the time of Antoninus the Defensor up to now, many persons have suffered wrong from the Roman Church, so that people publicly complain that their boundaries have been invaded by violence,³ their slaves carried off, even their movable goods seized by mere force

¹ Vide Hegel, *Städteverfassung von Italien*, i. 162, 3.

² Ep. i. 36.

³ See particular instances, Ep. i. 9, 55, 65, 73; iii. 44.

without any judicial process. All this requires the earnest watchfulness of your Experience. Whatever you may find to have been during this ten years taken away by violence, or in the name of the Church unjustly withheld, this is, by the authority of my present order, to be restored to the person to whom you may ascertain that it belongs; so that the injured person may not be compelled to come to me, and to undertake the labour of so long a journey; while besides, I here have no means of sifting the truth of his statement. Placing, therefore, before your mind the majesty of the coming Judgment, restore everything that has been sinfully taken away, and be sure that you are winning for me great gain, if you gather for me a reward rather than a rich income. Many persons also, I know, complain of the loss of their slaves. They say, that if any one's slave has run away from his master and declared himself to belong to the Church, the rulers of the Church at once have kept him as belonging to the Church, without reference to the law-courts, but maintaining by force the slave's allegation. This is as displeasing to me as it is abhorrent to the judgment of truth. I therefore will that your Experience, without allowing any delay, set right whatever you find to have thus happened; and any such slaves, who are now held as the property of the Church, as they have been taken without legal process, so are to be restored before any legal process; so that if Holy Church has any legal rights in them, those who hold them in possession may be ousted by a regular proceeding of law. All these matters set right without flinching; you will then be a true soldier of S. Peter, if in his causes you keep firm hold of the truth, without any favour to him. Further, if you see that anything may justly be held to belong to the Church, take care that you never assert your claim by force, especially because I have established an order, under pain of anathema,¹ that summary seizure is never to be made by our Church of any town or country estate; but whatever by reason belongs to the poor, by reason is to be claimed; lest while a good thing is done in a way which is not good, that which God justly demands of us be charged with injustice. As to the laity of rank and the governor, I beg that you will make them love you for your humility, rather than fear you for your haughtiness. But yet if you know that they are guilty of any injustice against any of the poor, you will at once change your humility into firmness, so that as long as they act well you may help them, and when they do wrong you may be their opponent. But so act that your humility may never be grovelling, nor your authority overbearing; but let rectitude give a flavour to your humility, and humility make rectitude itself courteous.'

But in a subsequent letter² these general directions are

¹ Vide Acts of a Roman Council, 595; S. Greg. *Opp.*, vol. ii. 1289.

² Ep. i. 44. In Ep. ii. 32 is another business-like set of directions to his agent, Peter the sub-deacon. He is to restore some land; to favour Jewish dwellers on the farms who wish to become Christian; to get rid of useless cattle; to diminish the stock of mares (*quas valde inutiliter habemus*),

expanded into most curious details. He sends to his agent, Peter the sub-deacon, a regular Land Law for the management of the Church estates in Sicily. It is a picture full of life and reality, of the conditions under which land was held and tilled at the time, the obligations of the tenant, the arbitrary exactions and the burdensome and unjust customs which were continually creeping into permanent use, the claims of farmers and their families to fixity of tenure, their liabilities and their right to protection from their landlord. The document is much too long to quote, and would require, besides, a legal commentary. But a few specimens may be inserted to show how the great landlord at Rome went into the *minutiæ* of the business of his Sicilian estate with his agent, and with what determined and earnest justice he set himself to guard his tenants from the unfairness and oppression of his officers, and their constant tendency towards fees and pickings for themselves. Thus, the rent of the Church estates in Sicily, like that of the land generally in the island, consisted partly in cargoes of corn, furnished by the tenants, the *rustici ecclesiæ*, to the agent, and shipped by him to Rome at the peril of the tenants; partly, in equivalent money payments. But the tenants, Gregory writes, had been hardly dealt with and burdened in the assessment of these rents. Accordingly, he peremptorily orders that the assessment is henceforth to depend on the public market price of wheat. He further orders that, in case of shipwreck, the loss, if reasonable care had been taken, shall not fall on the tenant, or oblige him to furnish another shipload; that the tenants should not be compelled, as they had been unfairly and unrighteously, to deliver the corn in a larger bushel than was used to measure it in the warehouses of the Church, or to reckon a larger number of parts (*sextarii*) to the bushel than the legal and nominal number; and he fixes definitely the measure of the bushel to be used. The gains and perquisites of agents and middlemen were thus cut off. The tenants, further, of some of the Church farms were vexed and worried by various kinds of small customary surcharges and additions to their legal payments, doubtless for the benefit of some collector or official. Fixed charges had a customary percentage added to them; the pound weight was reckoned to be the pound and something more; the customary market dues gradually kept on swelling. Doubtless it keeping only a few for the benefit of the farmers, and to sell the rest; to set the herdsmen, who have cost more than they brought in, on agricultural work, &c.

was the regular course of things in a disordered state of society; and Sicily, from the days of Verres, had been fertile in abuses of this kind. But they moved Gregory's indignation. These surcharges, he writes, are most unjust; all the more if they have been customary for many years. 'We utterly detest the whole thing, and we desire that it may be put an end to in our patrimony.' He bids his agent make a fair estimate of what the *rustici* ought to pay, and to consolidate it into one payment.

'And lest after my death,' he adds, 'the surcharges which we have put an end to, and have included in the total amount of payment, should be again imposed, and both the main payment be increased, and also the tenant compelled to pay extra charges, we desire that you draw up certificates of security respecting these payments, according as you impose them, saying how much each man is to pay, cutting off market dues and extra charges and corn fees; and the profit from these petty payments, which used to come to the governor's profit, we desire henceforth to be a deduction, to be applied to your use, from the whole sum which you have to remit to us.'

Another frequent cause of oppression under all loose governments is noticed and redressed as follows. Speaking of some form of land tax (*burdatio*), paid in three instalments in the year, he says: '—

'We have learned that the first instalment presses very hard on our tenants (*rusticos*); for before they are able to sell their produce, they have to discharge the tax; and as they have no means of their own, they are forced to borrow from money-lenders, and have to pay heavy interest on the loan: by which they are involved in ruinous expense. Therefore we order that what they would have to borrow for this purpose from outsiders may be openly advanced to them by you, and be received back from the tenants by degrees as they realize their produce; so that they may not be driven hard for time, and be forced to sell at a lower price what would have been quite sufficient at its proper price for their contributions.'

He makes stringent regulations against unjust weights and measures in receiving the tenants' payments. 'Break them, wherever you find them,' he writes; for Peter's predecessor had thought that he was not at liberty to destroy them. He forbids anything to be exacted from the tenant except according to just weight. He forbids his officers to receive anything except cheap and trifling gifts of food. He forbids excessive fees for marriages, and limits the amount; and they are to go to the farmer and not to the Church. He

¹ Cf. Ep. v. 8; and see Hegel, i. 198, and Ducange.

forbids the practice of claiming a Church farm back for the Church on the death of the farmer: his relations are to be allowed to succeed without loss; and if his children are under age, trustees are to be appointed for their benefit. Fees of all kinds are to be discouraged; where there is a fair reason for them, they are at any rate not to come into the accounts of the Church: 'for we will not that the purse of the Church be defiled by discreditable gains.' If a farmer (*conductor*) has taken something unjustly from a tenant (*colonus*), and been compelled to give up his unjust gain, this is to be restored to the tenant, and not to go to the Church: 'it is not to be turned to our use, lest we ourselves be abettors of violence.' And his agent is to take great care that premiums are not to be taken from farmers for letting farms, lest the temptation be given to a frequent change of farmers, in order to get fresh premiums: 'the result of which change will be that the Church farms will never be cultivated.' The expenses of leases are to be checked. The agent is to receive from the Church farms no more than is customary for his own grange and cellar; and any purchases which he may have to make are to be made from outsiders, not from the Church tenants.

This is but a small part of the document, which proceeds to go into special cases of hardship or difficulty, dealing with all in the same spirit of moderation, equity and good sense, and with the same earnest wish to protect the weak, and to make fair allowance for all claims. And he thus concludes:—

'All these directions you are carefully to read over and over again: put aside all that easy-going slackness which is in your character. The instructions which I have sent to the tenants (*rusticos*) are to be carefully read out through all the farms, that they may know in what points they are to defend themselves against wrong by our authority; and let the originals or copies be given them. Take care that you keep every point unimpaired; for in giving these directions for upholding justice I free myself from responsibility, and you, if you neglect them, incur it. Think of the terrible Judge who is coming, and let your conscience tremble at His advent, lest it fear in vain then, when before Him heaven and earth shall tremble. You have heard what I wish. See to what you do.'

These instructions were among the early acts of his pontificate; they were sent almost immediately on his coming into his office. They were not a mere burst of hasty zeal, which cooled with time. Almost at the end of his reign, we have the following letter to his agent¹ at Syracuse:—

¹ Ep. xiii. 34 (a. 603).

'Your Experience remembers what and what sort of an oath you took at the sacred body of the blessed Apostle Peter. Relying on it, we have committed to you the matter in dispute to be inquired into in his patrimony at Syracuse. You must therefore have always before your eyes your promise, and the fear of S. Peter, and so act, that neither by men in this life, nor by Almighty God in the last judgment, you may be rebuked.

'By the information of Salerius, our secretary, we learn that you have found the bushel by which the Church tenants were obliged to furnish corn was one of 25 *sextarii*.¹ This we felt at once to be detestable; and we are sorry that you should have waited to make it a matter of discussion. As, however, you say that you destroyed this bushel, and made a just one, we are glad. But the secretary took pains to point out to us the amount which, by the frauds of the farmers, has been collected in the hands of your Experience. Satisfied, therefore, as we are at your careful destruction of the unjust measure, because we look forward to the future, we must also think about the evil doings which are past, lest, if what the farmers have fraudulently taken from the tenants reach us, the sins of which they are guilty be also laid to our account. We desire therefore that with all good faith and honesty, remembering the fear of Almighty God, and the bond laid on you by the blessed Apostle Peter, you make a list in each farm of the poor and needy; then, that out of the moneys found to be fraudulently taken, you buy cows, sheep, and pigs, and distribute them to each of the poor labourers. This we desire you do in concert with Bishop John and Hadrian, our secretary and official; and if it be necessary, you may call into counsel Julian, so that no one else know it; but let the business be secret. You three arrange among yourselves whether the same allowance shall be given to these same poor peasants in money or in goods. . . . I, in the words of the Master of the nations, "have all and abound;" I seek not riches, but reward. Give, therefore, to all, that out of the opportunity of reward entrusted to you, you may in the day of judgment show me the profit you have made; which if you do, honestly, faithfully, heartily, you will here receive it in your children, and afterwards you will have full recompense when the Eternal Judge comes to try us.'

The cruelties and frauds of the fiscal system which had been grinding down the labouring population of the Empire for more than two centuries are familiar to readers of history. It is plain from Gregory's letters that the condition of the Church tenants was often nearly as bad. They suffered under the usual iniquities of middlemen and contractors, and the selfishness and greediness of agents, responsible only to a distant and perhaps indifferent master. They were cheated in assessment and in measure. They were subjected to all kinds of vexatious fees, and dues and extra charges. With

¹ The old normal number was 16. It had been increased by usage. Gregory (Ep. i. 44) had limited it to 18.

no capital or ready money, they had to struggle with usurious debts and mortgages. They were liable to be called upon to pay twice or thrice over what had been already received by a speculating official. It was their ordinary lot, and the best they could hope for was to be fleeced as mercifully as might be. Gregory had the originality and independence of mind to see that all this, customary as it had become, was unjust, wicked, abominable in the sight of the Eternal Judge, and he acted on his conviction with resolution and persistence. It is something in those times to see a man avow his belief in justice, and to make a systematic effort to carry real justice into the details of business, and, if necessary, against interests that were otherwise dear to him; for the produce of the Sicilian estates was the revenue of the Church, and the food of the poor of Rome.

And at Rome his justice and his liberality were not without their detractors.¹ They murmured at him as 'a spend-thrift and a squanderer of the manifold treasure of the patriarchate.' A curious story gained currency. It was said that a terrible famine fell on the city in the year of his death; his enemies raised the cry of his waste and dilapidations of the Church patrimony, and the mob were with difficulty prevented from venting their rage against him by burning his books. Some of them perished, and the rest were saved by the courage of his friend, Peter the Deacon, the same who was the interlocutor in his *Dialogues*. Peter represented that it was useless to try and exterminate books which had circulated all over the world, and it was, further, a monstrous sacrilege. For, the strange legend went on to say, Peter declared on oath that the Holy Spirit had often in the shape of a dove rested on his master's head while he was composing; and he offered this warrant of his truth, that the sign of his veracity should be his own immediate death, and that if he survived he would himself burn the books. Accordingly, with the Gospel in his hand, he ascended the pulpit; he gave his witness to Gregory's sanctity, and then he expired.

The enforcement of justice and care for the poor and helpless in the large and increasing patrimony of the Roman Church was in itself a task of some magnitude. But in a time of the abeyance of all the ordinary functions of Government in Italy, the business which fell to the share of a willing protector of the oppressed, and an enthusiast in the cause of right like Gregory, was much more than this. With no one

¹ Joan. Diac. iv. 69.

else to turn to for advice or help, men naturally turned to so conspicuous a person, one who would not shrink from the burdens of his position. The bulk of the large collection of the letters of his thirteen years of rule consists of directions or advice on cases submitted to him, and calling for his interference. They are, of course, largely ecclesiastical; but they are also very numerous in the sphere of what he still calls the *Respublica*, the civil and social interests of the population of the Western Empire, especially Italy. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that he was the volunteer and unofficial Secretary of State for the Government at Constantinople in those western parts, now so loosely and precariously connected with it. All central control was lost, and official greed and wrong had their fling, and were as merciless and desolating as the barbarians. He classes together, as the two great evils of his time, the sword of the Lombards and the oppression of the provincials by the 'perversity,' the 'iniquity,' of the State officers, judges, and collectors of taxes.¹ These persons paid for their offices, and excused their exactions by the necessity of recouping themselves. Sardinia, Corsica, and Sicily were driven to despair by the cruelty of the imperial officers; the landed proprietors of Corsica fled to the Lombards (*nefandissima gens*), or sold their children, under the tyranny. There was no one who cared to interfere; no one but the great Churchman at Rome, whose heart bled at the miseries of the time, and whose blood boiled at its injustice.² The great Bishop of ancient Rome, the inheritor of the Church and of the traditions of the Apostles, S. Peter and S. Paul, spoke with an authority which no one else had, when he reproved a negligent or oppressive provincial governor, or commended a good one, or when he counselled resistance to the Lombards, or peace with them, as well as when he called on the dilatory flock of an Episcopal see to fill up their vacant bishopric, or restrained an over-zealous bishop from worrying the Jews, or inflicted the sharp lashes of his indignation or irony on a negligent or a self-indulgent or an impertinent one. The bishops in the Italian cities and islands had so commonly occupied the places of responsibility left vacant by the civil authorities that this interference on Gregory's part was the more natural. He writes to bishops, as well as to civil officers, to urge vigilance against the barbarians, and the careful organization of the night watches on the walls of the

¹ Ep. v. 39, 42; viii. 2.

² Ep. v. 42, a report of Gregory to the Empress; and Ep. xi. 5, quoted by Hegel, i. 173, 4.

cities.¹ His deep interest in the condition of Italy and the Empire, his keen sympathy with all who suffered either from the disasters of the times, or from the selfishness and injustice of their brethren, his fearlessness of responsibility, and unshrinking readiness for work, attracted to him all the difficulties, all the complaints, all the troubles of the time; and he threw himself into cases of individual hardship or distress with the same resolute earnestness with which he organized general measures on a large scale for the discipline of the Church, or the improvement of its public service, or the conduct of a great foreign mission.

The way in which in Gregory the ancient Roman magnanimity and proud love of fairness were united with Christian charity is seen in his treatment of the Jews. The feeling of the Empire and of the Church was against them, and he shared it. He reproves the Bishop of Luna for not enforcing the prohibition which forbade the Jews to hold Christian slaves.² He orders the Bishop of Naples to prevent the sale by the Jews of Christian captives from Gaul,³ and to interfere with the ingenious arrangement by which the sons of Basil the Jew had become Christians in order that the family might hold Christian slaves. He is very angry when some Church officials, in want of money, sell Church plate to a Jew, and orders the Jew to be prosecuted.⁴ He urges preaching and

¹ Ep. viii. 18; ix. 4, 73. Thus he writes to the bishop of Terracina: 'As we have learned that many excuse themselves from the watches on the walls, your Fraternity will take care that you allow no one, either in our name or in the name of the Church, to exempt himself from the duty of the watches, but that all be indiscriminately obliged to take their turn; so that by all joining in the work of watching the guard of the city may be by God's help secured.' 'We yet possess,' says Sir Francis Palgrave, 'the solemn chaunt by which the sentinel of Modena during the Hungarian invasion in the ninth century, pacing along the rampart, cheered his companions, and beguiled the weary watches of the night:—

"O tu qui servas armis ista mœnia,
Noli dormire, moneo, sed vigila.
Dum Hector vigil exstitit in Troja
Non eam cepit fraudulenta Græcia.

Fortis juvenus, virtus audax bellica,
Vestra per muros audiantur carmina:
Et sit in armis alterna vigilia,
Ne fraus hostilis hæc invadat mœnia.
Resultet Echo comes: eja, vigila!
Per muros, eja, dicat Echo, vigila!"

It was first published by Muratori. See Palgrave, *Normandy*, i. 415 and 719.

² Ep. iv. 21; i. 10; viii. 21; iii. 38. ³ Ep. ix. 36. ⁴ Ep. i. 68.

argument for their conversion, and he is in no way disposed to grant them favours ; but he sternly discourages the ready inclination of the time to convert them by force or annoyance, or to deny them their rights.¹ He listens to the complaint made by the Jews of Provence of the violence employed to bring them to baptism, and enjoins the Bishops of Arles and Marseilles to abstain from such unchristian and such useless ways of bringing them into the Church. He insists on the prohibition against building new synagogues.² But when the Jews of Cagliari appealed to him to restrain the zeal of a Jewish convert, who, with a convert's fervour against his old faith, had raised a mob and turned the Jewish synagogue into a church, Gregory at once wrote strongly to the Bishop of Cagliari to condemn the injustice and insolence of the act, and to insist that their synagogue should be restored to the Jews.³ So he rebukes an over-zealous Bishop of Palermo, on the complaint of the Jews of Rome on behalf of their brethren in Sicily :—' The Jews ought to assume no liberty in their synagogues beyond what the law allows them ; but, on the other hand, in what is allowed them they ought to suffer no prejudice.' He has to insist very strongly to protect the Jews of Terracina in their right of meeting against neighbours who complained that they disturbed the congregation in the church ;⁴ and he peremptorily orders one of his officers to restore the bond of a Jewish debtor, which the officer had refused to give back after the debt had been paid.⁵ Such straightforward justice seems easy and natural to us. It has never been very common anywhere, and certainly was not common in Gregory's days.

But it must not be supposed that Gregory was what would now be called a tolerant ruler ; with no one, in those days, was toleration more than the rare exception to the general rule of persecution. His forbearance depended on circumstances. With the Jews, he saw that violence would only exasperate a race, outwardly submissive, but of proverbial tenacity of character, and with great and sacred traditions. He wished to win them ; he was not above putting secular inducements before them to make conversion easier : ' If the parents only feigned conversion, he would gain the children ;'⁶ but he knew it was no use to force them. But with barbarians and heretics, and the pagan populations which still lingered in the ruder districts of Italy, he had no such scruples. In Africa the Donatists were still formidable rivals to the

¹ Ep. i. 47.² Ep. ix. 6.³ Ep. viii. 25.⁴ Ep. i. 10, 35.⁵ Ep. ix. 56.⁶ Ep. v. 8.

Catholic Church. He was willing to let the heresy die out,¹ and even to let the existing Donatist bishops retain their position.² But against any favour shown to the sect, or any attempt to prolong their succession, he firmly protested.³ He without scruple invoked the aid of the civil power.⁴ He would allow no Manichæans on the Church estates in Sicily; his agent was to 'persecute' them, and 'reclaim them to the Catholic faith.'⁵ He severely reprimands a Sardinian bishop for allowing any one on the Church estates to remain a pagan: if any tenant is obstinate, his rent is to be increased till he is 'compelled to hasten to the right way;' and he adds, 'if I find any pagan peasant belong to any bishop in Sardinia, I will take a sharp revenge on that bishop.' If the pagan labourers refuse to be converted they are to be punished, 'etiam cum verberibus.'⁶ He orders the severe corporal punishment of a Jew who had tempted Christians to some strange rites, and had purchased Christian slaves. He orders a bishop of Terracina to punish in the severest manner, 'so that God may be appeased and others take warning by the example,' some people 'who worshipped trees, and did other things contrary to the Christian faith.'⁷ It sounds as if he had ordered the punishment of death.

It was, of course, his great ecclesiastical position which gave him all this authority in civil or social affairs. But, in his view, the enforcement of justice and mercy, the maintenance of order and peace, the right and obligation to keep civil officers in mind of their functions and duty, was part of his business, as holding the first place in the government of God's Church. Upon him had devolved the office, not only of the Priest in respect of religious service, but also of the Prophets, as teachers and witnesses of all righteousness to great and small, which he found described in the Bible. Still, the primary and direct concern of his life was the administration and discipline of the great institution over which he believed that he had been called to preside with the authority of S. Peter.

The ecclesiastical claims of the Roman see had come, at the time when Gregory became Pope, to be in general terms little short—though they still *were* short—of what they were

¹ Ep. i. 77.² Ep. ii. 48; v. 5.³ Ep. iv. 34, 35.⁴ Ep. v. 8.⁵ Ep. iv. 26.⁶ iii. 38; ix. 65. Joan. Diac. iii. 1: 'Jam Barbaricinos Sardos' ('La Barbagia di Sardegna,' Dante, *Par.* xxiii. 95) 'et Campaniæ rusticos, tam prædicationibus quam verberibus emendatos, a paganizandi vanitate removerat.'⁷ Ep. viii. 18.

in later times. They had not only been tenaciously kept up at Rome, but they were readily admitted and appealed to wherever need was felt of a refuge, or an ally, in the theological conflicts of the time; and where there had been ecclesiastical resistance to them, the party of resistance had either placed itself hopelessly in the wrong, or had been left by surrounding jealousies or indifference to maintain an unequal contest with an antagonist so powerful as the Patriarch of the West. But though the ecclesiastical recognition of these claims was great, they were not either unlimited or uncontradicted, and their public acceptance, as a fact, was not yet assured. The Patriarch of the new capital—for though it was new it was the capital of the renewed Empire—the Patriarch of Constantinople, standing at the head of the great Patriarchates of the Church of the East, was a formidable rival. The bishops of Rome had not yet shaken themselves free from the hold of strong and suspicious governments. They had submitted, in several instances, to be the nominees of the Arian and Gothic kings. They had submitted to be nominees of the Byzantine Court. The 'most Christian' Emperor claimed the right of approving their election, when the election was not anticipated by a nomination. Gregory himself recognized the Emperor's power to forbid his appointment, and was 'consecrated by order of the Emperor.'¹ The Eastern Government, when alarmed or offended, still, and after Gregory's time, compelled their attendance on the Bosphorus, and did not always respect their persons. And the Popes themselves had at times severely shaken the authority of their great judgment seat. The vacillations and dogmatic prevarications of Vigilius, who had allowed himself to be made the tool and accomplice of the intrigues of Justinian's Court, were a serious counterbalance to the influence won by men like S. Leo and S. Gelasius.¹ His weakness and double-dealing had caused the greatest confusion and perplexity, even in Italy. They had occasioned a dangerous schism in Istria, the province of which Aquileia was the metropolis. The Istrian bishops challenged the authority and the orthodoxy even of Gregory, refused him as a judge because he was a party in the dispute, threatened an alliance against him with the bishops of Gaul, and appealed from his violence to the Emperor; and the Emperor received their appeal, and enjoined peace. Gregory had to be very cautious on the perilous subject of the 'Three Chapters,' even with the Catholic-minded Theo-

¹ Ep. I. 5; Greg. Turon. Hist. Fr. x. 1; Lib. Diurn. Rozière, p. xix.

dolinda.¹ Much as there was to support and consolidate the Roman claims, they were not yet, humanly speaking, safe and beyond the reach of great and permanent injury. A strong and fortunate ruler at Constantinople might even now have, if not shattered them, yet greatly impaired and abridged them: he might even yet have shifted the centre of gravity in the Church from the West to the East.

To prevent this was one of the great objects of Gregory's policy; and more than anything else, his pontificate decisively made it impossible. For he showed how great and how useful to Christianity Rome could be without the Empire. What may be called his home administration, the ecclesiastical government of Italy, the islands, the Adriatic provinces, and, less directly, Gaul, the portion of the Church territory which came immediately under his influence, was vigilant, resolute, and stern. He orders his bishops as if they were officers at their posts, and his tone is high and peremptory. He allows no negligence, no shrinking from duty, no pursuit inconsistent with their office. He puts up with no resistance, no affectation of dignity, or show of independence. Any opposition of this kind brings down on the offender the scourge of his rebuke and keen sarcasm. A free-living and jovial bishop of Salona,—a refractory bishop of Ravenna, who in the residence of the Emperor's lieutenant thinks that he may assert his position,²—a bishop of Vienne, who teaches grammar and the Latin poets instead of attending to his proper work,³—a rough Sardinian bishop of Cagliari, who had taken an extravagant burial fee, and who, to spite a neighbour, had on Sunday morning before mass ploughed up his standing wheat, and after mass removed his landmarks,⁴—an idle bishop of Naples,⁵ who neglected the poor and the oppressed, and spent his time and his money in ship-building, are treated with scant ceremony and very plain speaking. But masterful and imperious as his orders are, they are given, as far as it is possible to judge, in the interests of a vigorous discipline, and to keep up and enforce a high standard of life and work in the great ecclesiastical army—bishops, clergy, and monks, with their large number of dependents—over which he presided, and who, as might be expected in such times, needed a clear purpose and a strong hand to keep them from every form of

¹ See the memorial of the Istrian bishops, Troya, *Cod. Dipl. Longob.* i. 154. Also Greg. Ep. iv. 2-4, on which De Rubeis writes—'Sanctissimi Pontificis prudenti œconomia factum, ut Capitulorum negotio dissimulato, ecclesiæ unitatem Regina servaret.'—Troya, i. 168.

² Ep. ii. 52; iii. 56; v. 15.

⁴ Ep. ix. 1, 2, 3.

³ Ep. xi. 54.

⁵ Ep. xiii. 36.

selfishness and disorder. He holds up before the bishops, throughout his letters, and in many different forms, that the first and most urgent duty of a bishop, even beyond that of study and prayer, is to watch over the poor and the oppressed, to assist and feed them, and to protect them at any hazard against injustice and violence.¹ His deep sense of responsibility, his love of right and goodness, his ready sympathy for the weak and the suffering, his warm affections, shine visibly through the severity of his reproofs and the strictness of his commands; nay, even the genuine personal humility of the man, his reluctant submission to a heavy task, and his modest estimate of his power to fulfil it, are not concealed by his very determined purpose to let nothing stand in his way in carrying his task through to the uttermost. His judgments were not always discriminating, he sometimes accepted from his agents one-sided statements, his rebukes were sometimes hasty; these are his own frank admissions;—it may also be that the objects of his sympathy were not always as worthy as he thought them—such possibilities occur to a reader of his letters; not unfrequent at any time, they become likely in a rough and disordered one. But of the general aim and spirit of his administration, of his sincere and disinterested wish to do his own duty, and to make every one else do theirs; of his life-long war against corruption, selfishness, sloth, and oppression in the Church, no reader of his letters can doubt.

In a state of social disorganization like that of the sixth century, corruption was sure to be deep and wide-spread. The form in which Gregory had specially to deal with it was simony. We do not gather from his letters that the higher clergy, at least, were other than regular and respectable in their way of living. He finds fault with neglect, with ignorance, with temper, even with fondness for jovial society, but very seldom, in the case of bishops, with license. But what he is afraid of, especially in the semi-barbarous Churches, like that of the Franks, is the growth of corrupt bargaining in obtaining posts, which had now become places of dignity and influence; and he denounces and condemns it with a vehemence and in terms which later times found inconvenient. 'Simony'—this was his constant phrase—'was the first and the worst of *heresies*.' This was not mere rhetorical strength of phrase. He meant distinctly to say that simony was a crime against the faith as much as Arianism, though in a different way. His zeal against it does him the highest honour. He was so fearful of the slightest step towards it, or the faintest

¹ See Ep. x. 36.

pretext for it, that he systematically refused all presents offered to himself.¹ But his language was a curious example of the dangers of a tempting argument and an incautiously large premiss. It was a telling thing to say that simony was a heresy and the worst of heresies; that the grace of God could not be purchased for money, and that therefore, what Simon could not receive, he could not give. It answered Gregory's purpose; but in later times the position was seen to have formidable consequences. It became necessary, as time went on, and the idea of infallibility came in, to maintain that no Pope, however bad in life, could be a heretic in faith; and further, the validity of half the ordinations in Christendom depended on their being absolutely unaffected by the unworthiness of the ordainers. But as it was quite certain that Popes had been guilty of simony, it became necessary to revise the definition of heresy, even though given deliberately by a Pope, and to take simony out of it; it was equally necessary to do so, to save the orders of the whole Church. The difficulty was easily perceived; the trouble which it gave, and the shifts to which recourse was necessary, to get rid of the ruinous inferences, inevitable from Gregory's sweeping propositions, in which he was further supported by S. Leo and S. Ambrose, may be seen in Gratian's harmonized collection of canonical rules.² But if Gregory, in his honest hatred of corruption, used dangerous weapons against it, and gave embarrassment to his less scrupulous successors, he was illogical in the best of causes. He is not the first or the last reasoner who has defended truth and right by bad arguments. Heresy was the word which frightened his age, and certainly over hastily he caught at it. But indeed he was right in thinking that this kind of corruption, by which even good men came to think that they might buy themselves into Church offices and work, would as surely demoralize and poison the Church as heresy itself. It was worth a mistake and misstatement, which only affected the equally great over-statements of men afterwards, in order to impress in strong and alarming language on the rough people round him the danger of degrading by discreditable bargains the one office which commanded moral respect in an age of violence.

He thus kept up the authority of his see, and presented it to the troubled and violent world around him as a public benefit. He required power to contend with anarchy, and he used it freely with the willing consent of the West. But

¹ Ep. ii. 23; i. 66; ix. 2.

² Gratian, *Decretum*, p. ii. c. i. qu. 1.

he had one anxiety—the greatness and the claims of the Patriarch of Constantinople. The rivalry between the two was inevitable. The Eastern Patriarch, chief of the ancient Greek-speaking and Syrian Churches, could appeal to traditions quite as venerable as those of Rome; he ruled over a clergy more cultivated and more learned,¹ and quite as much versed in the dogmatic and practical Church questions of the time; and though he was not, like the Roman bishop, alone in his imperial city, and was overshadowed by the presence of the Emperor and the Court, it was difficult to say whether this detracted from, or added to, his dignity and his importance. Gregory shows no jealousy of the Emperor and the Government. He treats the orders of the Court, the *voluntas palatii*, with the greatest deference, even when they seem to trench on the ecclesiastical province,² or threaten interference with his own orders.³ His language is even obsequious, to those whom he looks upon, not only as ‘Lords of the Universe’ by the gift of God, but as ‘guardians’ by the same authority, ‘of the peace of the Church.’⁴ But on the pretensions and actions of his brother Patriarch he keeps a watchful and severe eye. John *the Faster* was a man of as great reputation for sanctity at Constantinople as Gregory at Rome. There had been some ill-feeling between him and Gregory’s predecessor Pelagius,⁵ who had claimed to annul the proceedings of a synod at Constantinople, on the ground that John had used the title of Œcumenical or Universal Bishop. The title was really no novelty; it was given by Justinian to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and is enshrined in his laws.⁶ But the assumption was no doubt a threatening one to the Primacy of Rome; and we can see signs in the early letters of Gregory’s pontificate that it had made a strong impression upon him.⁷ At length, in the fifth year of his pontificate (January 595), Gregory thought it time to make a stand against a title which by

¹ The difference of culture at Rome and Constantinople may be seen by comparing the style of the Greek reports and histories of Priscus, Procopius, and Menander, with anything written at the same time in Latin. The Byzantines still write good literary Greek, well worded and well composed, fit for a clear statement or well-told story. The Latin has already sunk down to mediæval degeneration, often strong in natural and unexpected phrases, but with no sense of the value and proportion of words, and rude and clumsy in structure. It soon quitted the control of grammar.

² Vide Ep. ix. 41, and v. 21, about Maximus of Salona.

³ Vide Ep. iii. 65; iv. 20, 47; v. 40.

⁴ Ep. v. 21; vii. 6.

⁵ Ep. v. 18.

⁶ Gieseler, § 117, n. 29; § 94, n. 72; § 93, n. 20.

⁷ Vide iii. 53 (593).

continued usage was becoming formidable; and he began the series of famous letters,¹ of which such ample use has been made against his successors, condemning, in the most unsparing terms, the title of Universal Bishop. The condemnation is, indeed, as absolute as definite reasons and violent language can make it; but the popular controversial use of it, as a condemnation by Gregory of the pretensions of the Roman See, must be considered as an instance of theological boldness or innocence. For it is assumed that Gregory, in condemning the word, absolutely condemned the thing; whereas, the truth is that he only condemned the word and title, and that because it had been assumed by his rival at Constantinople, and symbolized his pretensions. Gregory in his objections shows the exaggerations and the inconsistencies of temper: if there is a 'Universal Bishop,' he says, then there are no other bishops; a 'Universal Bishop' absorbs or subjects to himself all the members of the Universal Church;² none of the saints, not even Peter, used the word. Further, it is 'corrupting' the faith of the Universal Church, for if one bishop be universal, the whole Church, if he falls, falls with him;³ and many patriarchs of Constantinople have been heretics. He seems absolutely unconscious that the same objections might be made to all that he took for granted in his own position and duty. But to be all that the title of Universal Bishop practically and really signified Gregory certainly made no hesitating claim. He spurned, indeed, the pompous name, as unbecoming a Christian, and as invented by that ostentation and pride of office which he very sincerely despised and hated. And his protest undoubtedly does further exclude that later development of the Papal office which annulled the independence of bishops, and placed its own delegated authority on their thrones. But that every bishop in Christendom, including him of Constantinople himself, owed to the Patriarch of Rome and the successor of S. Peter an account of his faith and conduct, and was liable to his judgment, was certainly Gregory's belief, and he systematically acted upon it.⁴ The vehement and extravagant language⁵ in which he condemned the use of the

¹ Ep. v. 18-21; vii. 27, 31, 33; ix. 68.

² v. 18; vii. 33.

³ vii. 27. So v. 19: 'In isto scelesto vocabulo si consentimus nihil est aliud quam fidem perdere.'

⁴ Ep. ix. 59: 'Si qua culpa in Episcopis invenitur, nescio quis sedi Apostolicæ Episcopus subjectus non sit. Cum vero culpa non exigit, omnes secundum rationem humilitatis æquales sunt. ix. 12: Nam de Constantinopolitana ecclesia quod dicunt, quis eam dubitet sedi Apostolicæ esse subjectam, quod et piissimus dominus Imperator, et pater noster Episcopus (i.e., Cyriacus), assidue profitentur?' See also iii. 57.

⁵ The violence of his language is inexhaustible: 'Superbum voca-

invidious title by John the Faster was called forth by the anxious care with which he guarded the prerogative of Old Rome from the encroachments of the New. The famous *Servus Servorum Dei* doubtless expressed what he wished to consider himself. But the servant of the servants of God would assuredly have, in their interests as he thought, confronted pride and stiffened himself against resistance and punished insubordination in his bishops, with as much determination as if he had been invested with all the titles which could be devised by the Chanceries of the two capitals.¹

From his point of view Gregory was right. Imperialism² still filled the air, in the Church as well as the State, and was held to be a condition of the continued unity of the Church: the one unity that seemed left to mankind. A double government at Rome and Constantinople seemed, while every one was quarrelling, to be a standing menace to that unity, and his Roman instinct, as well as his ecclesiastical traditions, prompted Gregory to his formal and vehement protest against the pretensions of his Eastern rival. We have not the answer of John the Faster to Gregory's eager remonstrances. They made no impression on him or on the Emperor Maurice. The Emperor only observed that it was a pity to quarrel and cause scandal about such a 'frivolous' trifle. Gregory answered that there were trifles and trifles, and that when Antichrist should call himself God he will be but using an empty title of two syllables, though the act will be one of portentous blasphemy; and he goes on to add that the pride which claims to be called the one sole priest is a sign and herald of that of Antichrist. Boniface III. afterwards obtained from Maurice's murderer, the hateful usurper Phocas, a prohibition of the use of the title, which Gregory had in vain asked of Maurice. But it was revived under his successor Heraclius;³ and the Patriarch of Constantinople has never dropped the title of Œcumenical Patriarch. But in the West, and at Rome, the

bulum, scelestum, pompaticum, perversum, pestiferum, profanum, stultum, superstitiosum; imperialia verba, "nomen blasphemiae," nefandum nomen.' 'Quosdam superbe humiles et fecte blandos.' It amused the Greeks (vide vii. 33).

¹ Compare Ep. iv. 47: 'Ego . . . paratior sum mori, quam beati Petri ecclesiam meis diebus degenerare. Mores autem meos bene cognitos habes, quia diu porto: sed si semel deliberavero non portare, contra omnia pericula lætus vado.' Ep. v. 20: 'Qui contra omnipotentem Dominum per inanis gloriæ tumorem cervicem suum erigit, in omnipotenti Domino confido, quia meam sibi nec cum gladiis flectit.'

² 'Vestra pietas, quam omnipotens Deus cum serenissimo Domino, universo mundo præesse constituit.'—(To the Empress, Ep. v. 21.)

³ Gieseler, § 117, n. 29-34.

transaction was accepted, and was remembered, as a decisive and final blow to any claim, even to equality, on the part of the Bishop of the new capital. Gregory was inconsistent in his arguments and language. He may have been actually himself that which he was denouncing in his Greek brother. He may have inveighed against a word, while he was doing all that the word meant. He certainly availed himself, for his immediate purpose, of reasons, and committed himself to positions, which would be very inconvenient to his successors if they cared much about such objections. But though Rome and its Bishop still continued for some time longer subject to the civil rule of Constantinople, its ecclesiastical position with respect to the Patriarch was defined so clearly that it was accepted as the fixed understanding and tradition of Western Christendom.

There is one deep blot on Gregory's great name, and it is probably connected with his jealous resistance to the assertion of equality on the part of the Eastern Patriarch. The Emperor Maurice, as has been said, took part with the Patriarch. He ridiculed as 'frivolous' Gregory's vehement opposition to the obnoxious style and title; he refused to give way to it. There were other reasons why, though there was no break of official friendship and respect, Gregory thought he had cause to complain of Maurice. The Eastern Government had given him scant help against the Lombard enemies of the 'Respublica,' and had trifled with the honour and the sufferings of Italy. The Emperor had more than once seemed to countenance troublesome or unworthy bishops. He had thrown difficulties in the way of soldiers embracing the monastic life; and further, Maurice, who was careful in spending the public money, was also strict in exacting it, and to Gregory, whose sympathies were all with the over-burdened and frequently cheated taxpayers, the ruler who had to provide funds for the necessities of the Empire appeared as the harsh and grasping oppressor of the poor. All these grounds of offence and dislike were naturally strengthened by the Emperor's somewhat contemptuous support of the pretensions of his own Patriarch.¹ But, certainly, when Maurice's tragic fate came, Gregory felt no pity for him. He probably thought that it was the deserved punishment of a bad ruler.

¹ Vide Ep. v. 19: 'Postquam defendi ab inimicorum gladiis nullo modo possumus; postquam pro amore R. P. argentum, aurum, mancipia, vestes perdidimus; nimis ignominiosum est ut per eos [the Court] etiam fidem perdamus. In isto enim scelesto vocabulo consentire, quid est aliud quam fidem perdere?'

But if this had been all, however unjust the judgment, it would only have been an instance of the cruelty with which the best men on all sides have often felt towards their opponents. Unhappily this was not the worst. Whatever Maurice might have seemed to Gregory, Gregory knew that he had perished by the hand of a traitor, a murderer, and an usurper. Doubtless he did not know all that Phocas really was; but he knew that he was all this. Yet, without pausing, without hesitation, without a word of reserve, Gregory salutes him as the saviour and deliverer of the Empire, and breaks forth into rapture at the 'glad tidings of great joy' in words which no one can read without pain and shame. Fulsome adulation was, indeed, too common; but such adulation on such an occasion, from so good and great a man, is something more than ordinary flattery.

'*Glory to God in the highest*, who, as it is written, changes times and transfers kingdoms; for, in Almighty God's incomprehensible government, the alternate vicissitudes of mortal life succeed one another. When the sins of many are to be punished, one man is set up by whose hard rule the necks of his subjects are bowed beneath the yoke of tribulation; which is what we in our affliction have too long made proof of. But, again, the merciful God purposes to comfort the mourning hearts of the many: and then He raises up one man to the height of power, and by the bowels of His mercy pours into the hearts of all the grace of His rejoicing. And we trust to be early comforted by the abundance of this rejoicing, who are glad that your benignity and piety are come to the Imperial throne. *Let the heavens rejoice and let the earth be glad*, and let the whole people of the Commonwealth, hitherto so heavily afflicted, be made cheerful with your gracious acts. May the proud minds of the enemy be restrained by the yoke of your rule. May the broken and humbled spirit of your subjects be lifted up by your mercy.'

And he goes on to pray that in the new Emperor's 'most happy times' the Commonwealth may have peace, that fraud and violence may cease, and personal liberty be restored under the sway of a pious empire. 'For this is the difference between the Kings of the Nations and the Emperors of the "Republic," that the Kings of the Nations are the masters of slaves, and the Emperors of the Republic are the lords of free men.'

There is nothing to be said in excuse for this, either in substance or in manner. Gregory, who has no scruple in applying the sacred *Gloria in Excelsis* to the accession of a cruel murderer, was deeply offended when, at the installation of

¹ Ep. xiii. 31 (603); cf. xiii. 39.

a Patriarch of Constantinople, the clergy sang the verse of the Psalm, 'This is the day which the Lord hath made.' It was, he said, a profane misapplication to the creature of words used of the creature's Lord.¹ Never, certainly, did true and unselfish religion descend lower in flattering the prosperous wickedness which might serve its objects; and what Gregory hoped from Phocas was a support, which he had not been able to get from Maurice, against the pretensions of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and against the growing power of the Lombards.

In Church and State alike the idea of the Empire was still powerful, which long afterwards found expression in the *De Monarchia* of Dante. It was the hope and safeguard of the 'Christian republic,' of the civilization and the lawful order of society. In common with his contemporaries, Gregory, whatever he might think of the person who bore the office, had for the office itself the deepest reverence. And living all his life face to face with an advancing and formidable barbarism, which Italians could neither understand nor cope with, he was thrown all the more on what remained in Constantinople of the old strength and the old traditions of Rome. Maurice had left Italy to its fate; perhaps Phocas might take up again the policy of Justinian. It was only in the armies of the Imperial Government that he could find any counterpoise to the growing power of the barbarian Lombards; and though, at the moment, a precarious peace was supposed to exist, Gregory puts his case before the new Emperor in pathetic terms:—

'Your Serenity will learn from the mouth of my deacon how great has been our affliction. I pray that you will incline your pious ears to him, and the sooner pity us. For how we are crushed beneath the daily swords of the Langobards, and by their endless ravages, behold, for the length of five and thirty years, no words can adequately tell. But we trust in the Almighty Lord, that the blessings of His consolation, which He has begun towards us, He will fulfil, and that He who has raised up in the Commonwealth pious lords will also destroy our cruel enemies.'²

When Gregory became Pope (A.D. 590) the Lombards had been in Italy two and twenty years, and had not yet settled into the consistence of an organized state. The legend tells, indeed, how the 'long-haired' Autharit had marched through Italy to its extremity, Rhegium, and there had touched with his spear a pillar which stood in the sea, saying, 'Thus far shall

¹ Ep. vii. 7.² Ep. xiii. 38.

be the bounds of the Langobards.' On the crown of Agilulf, Autharit's successor, was said to be inscribed the title, 'Rex totius Italiæ.'¹ But these were anticipations. The Langobards were on the way to conquest, but they had not achieved it. They were masters in upper Italy, they had seized cities in the south; the Roman Exarch was supposed to be continually at war with the invaders, but the warfare was a desultory and ineffectual one; and the Lombard bands, though they found Rome and Naples too strong, wandered about Italy with little hindrance, except from the walls of the fortified cities. They were still in the first stage of the barbarian conquests, the stage of raids and forays, the destructive, exploratory, predatory stage.² Their devastations, their cruelties, their Arianism, and something specially coarse and repulsive in their character, excited the deepest antipathy among the Italians. Gregory's epithets are of the strongest: '*nefandissimus Autharit*'; '*nec dicendus Ariulplus*'; '*nefandissima gens Langobardorum*.' The epithets are like those sometimes applied to the Turks; they were the current ones of the time, and they continued in the mouths of Italians after Gregory's days, and when the Lombards were established in Italy. The Lombard spoilers, the Lombard brutalities, the Lombard cunning and treachery, were the heavy and immediate miseries which afflicted Gregory's countrymen. The Empire, which had destroyed the kingdom of the Goths, would not, the Italians hoped, endure the ruffian Lombards. But Belisarius and Narses were gone; and it was Narses who in his treasonable revenge had called in the Lombards. The Empire was hardly pressed in the East by Persians and Avars. Its efforts on behalf of Italy were slack, feeble, and fruitless. The Exarch at Ravenna kept up the form of war with the invaders, but his chief business seemed to be to prevent any one making peace with them. The most serious attempt to get rid of them was made, shortly before Gregory became Pope, by the Emperor Maurice, but it was not by the armies of the Empire.³ He sent, says the historian of the Lombards, his ambassadors to Childebert, king of the Franks, with a very large subsidy, in order that he should attack the Lombards and drive them out of Italy. Childebert, with a vast army, at once entered Italy; but the Lombards shut themselves up in the cities, and by

¹ Muratori, *Script. Rer. Ital.* ii. 304. Troya, i. 184.

² See the description of this in an earlier time (Justinian) in Procop. *Bell. Goth.* iii. 33, 34.

³ Paul. Diac. iii. 17, and comp. Troya, i. 84-113.

negotiations and presents made peace with Childebert, who went back to France. When the Emperor heard of this he demanded back the money which he had given to Childebert to hurt the Lombards; but Childebert, relying on his strength, did not even give him an answer about it. The Italians would not have had much to thank the Emperor for if he had brought the Franks into Italy; and he tried no other method of arresting the scourge which embittered Gregory's life.¹

The 'swords of the Lombards,' the betrayal and fall of cities, the inactivity and helplessness of the Exarch's ill-paid and ill-commanded troops: these are the burden of Gregory's letters. At first Gregory had thrown his weight and influence on the side of the Exarch.² He had looked on the Lombards as public enemies. He had corresponded with the imperial commanders, and given them information and advice about the movements of the enemy. But he soon found that he was leaning on a broken reed; and when Ariulf, the Lombard 'Duke' of Spoleto, sat down under the walls of Rome,³ slaying and maiming, and exacting ransom, and when the Duke of Benevento was threatening Naples without any hindrance from the Exarch, Gregory, how reluctantly we can clearly see, resolved to make the best terms he could with the spoilers. There is a curious passage in a letter of 594, in which he speaks of measures against the Lombards, in which he refused to take part.⁴ It seems to imply some sort of plot like S. Brice's Day, or the Sicilian Vespers. 'If,' he says, 'I had chosen to mix myself up with the death of the Lombards, at this moment the nation of the Lombards would neither have king, nor dukes, nor counts, and would be broken up in the greatest confusion. But because I fear God, I dare not mix myself up with the death of any man.'

His efforts were henceforth directed to bring about, if possible, a general peace; but if the Exarch, safe behind the marshes of Ravenna, and caring nothing for the miseries of the Italian provincials, preferred to keep the quarrel open, then to make a separate peace for the Roman Church and its possessions. These attempts gave great offence, not only to the Exarch Romanus, a personal enemy, but to the Emperor. The soldiers reported to Constantinople that the priests were meddling in State affairs, were being taken in by the crafty barbarians, and were sending false reports. Gregory's letter to the Emperor is curious:—

¹ Vide end of his exposition of Ezekiel.

² Vide ii. 29, 30.

³ Ep. ii. 46 (592).

⁴ Ep. iv. 47.

'In sending me their Most Serene commands, the Piety of our Lords, in their reprimands, while wishing to spare me, has not quite done so; for in gently calling me "simple," they call me a fool (*fatuus*) for being deceived by the craft of Ariulph. Well; I confess it is so. If your Piety had not said so, the facts proclaim it. For if I had not been a fool I never should have come to suffer what I do here, among the swords of the Lombards. But as to what I reported, that Ariulph was ready in good earnest to come over to the State (*Rempublicam*), not only am I not believed, but I am rebuked for having lied. . . . And if the captivity of my country were not every day and moment increasing, I would gladly hold my peace about any slight or ridicule thrown on myself. But what afflicts me is this, that the same thing which causes me to endure the charge of falsehood is that which daily brings Italy captive under the yoke of the Lombards. For while no credence is given to my information, the power of the enemy is enormously increasing. But I submit this to my most religious Lord: let him think all the ill that may be about me; but as to the welfare of the State (*Reipublicæ*), and the question of the loss of Italy, do not let him easily listen to everybody. Let him believe facts rather than words.'¹

It was not easy to make any peace, for the Lombards had many heads, and had not laid aside the uncontrollable habits of barbarian invaders; and Gregory, even when on good terms with their chiefs, continued to the end of his life to complain of the sufferings caused by the Lombard sword, and of their unscrupulous faithlessness. But he also took advantage of a change among the Lombards themselves to attempt a policy more in accordance with his own higher objects. Agilulf, from being 'Duke' of Turin, had become King of the Lombards (590); and further, he had married the Bavarian Theudolinda, the Catholic widow of the Arian Autharit. The consolidation of power had begun in Agilulf's strong and able hands. He was a leader with whom Gregory could treat more hopefully than with separate chiefs; and Theudolinda's influence, which was considerable, was, like that of the Burgundian Clotildis over Clovis, and of the Frank Bertha over Æthelbert, exerted on the side of which Gregory was the representative, the side of the more civilized and more authoritative religion of the Roman Empire. Gregory opened communication with Theudolinda. He dealt very respectfully with her prejudices on the burning question of the day, the condemnation by the Fifth Council of the alleged Nestorian 'Three Chapters,' supposed to be sanctioned by the Fourth. He sent her presents, and invited her help, both in furthering peace, and in bringing the Arian Lombards to the Church;

¹ Ep. v. 40.

and though the Lombards were too near their barbarian state to cease to be troublesome and insulting,¹ and Agilulf himself was a questionable convert,² the beginnings of a new state of things were made. The child of Agilulf and Theudolinda was baptized, and grew up a Catholic. The example of the Court had its effect on the chiefs and the people. Hopeless of getting rid of the Lombards, or subduing them, Gregory rightly thought that the next best thing was to unite them, at least in religion, with the Italians with whom they were to live. They long continued to be a military and ruling race; but they were entirely absorbed at last, and the foundations were laid by Gregory's policy of a fusion and union of races which produced, when it was completed, the strongest and most energetic among the populations of the peninsula. The Teutonic people, with their Teutonic speech, their national organization and customs, which were long guarded by the legislation of their kings, vainly struggled to maintain a separate nationality against the subtler and more powerful influences of the Latin atmosphere in which they lived. Of the language which they spoke, though an ample list of words remains, not a single connected sentence is any more to be read on parchment or monument; the name of the Lombards disappeared; but out of it was softened the famous and more familiar name of the Lombards; and Lombardy became for a time the name for Italy itself.³

When Gregory became Pope, it may be said that, in human judgment, the future of the Papacy was still uncertain. In the five centuries which had almost run out since the days of the Apostles, it had undoubtedly won a great position in the hierarchy of the Church. The Councils were the supreme authority in the Church; and to that supreme authority the Roman bishop, like all others, professed allegiance and submission. But his primacy was undoubted; what that primacy involved was a different question, and was by no means a clear one. But, generally, it seems plain that the custom had grown more and more at Rome of claiming in a vague way for the See the continued authority of the Apostles, S. Peter and S. Paul; not of S. Peter only, but of both the great pair who were believed to have founded the Church at Rome, and whose sacred bodies still lay there. Inference was often

¹ See his account of the sack of Crotona on the Adriatic in 596, when Agilulf had been six years in power.—Ep. vii. 26 (597).

² Hegel, i. 171.

³ Bluhme, *Gens Langobardorum*, pts. 1 and 2, 1868 and 1874. Meyer, *Sprache der Langob.*, 1877. Zeuss, p. 476.

rapid in those days, and did not trouble itself much about intermediate steps between a premiss and a conclusion ; and the exceptional character of the Roman Bishop seemed to flow obviously from that of those whose functions he exercised where they had lived and died. Practically the first result of this position was to make him the natural judge of appeals. Invested with the majesty of such traditions, and in the centre and capital of the Empire, he was the natural person to turn to, as arbiter and judge, when his brethren could not settle their disputes among themselves ; and from the convenience and fitness of such an arbiter there soon followed on his part the claim of exclusive right to hear and decide appeals. The second point was his relation to the councils of the Church. This relation, faint and overshadowed by much greater influences at Nicæa, had become more defined and more prominent at Chalcedon ; and since the days of S. Leo a right of confirmation and sanction different from that of the other patriarchs had come to be assumed as a matter of course among the traditions of Rome, though by no means accepted as a matter of course, and, under all circumstances, in the Eastern Church. But undoubtedly the ecclesiastical claims of the Roman Patriarch had been rising with the progress of the centuries, and with the ceaseless controversies of the Church, which emperors, even more than Popes, tried to direct and appease, and tried in vain. The right of admonishing their brethren, common to all bishops of the Church, was used by the Roman Bishop with a claim to special authority,¹ and in virtue of the interest in all parts of the Church which appeals to him from all parts had given him. By the time that Gregory became Pope there could be no question of the prerogative acknowledged in the Roman See, and the rights which this gave of direct superintendence over a large part of the Church, and of authoritative remonstrance everywhere.

But great as the position was, it had much vagueness about it, and it was not yet assured. The East was becoming jealous, and formidable as a rival. It had learning ; it had discipline and cohesion ; it had living examples of ascetic saintliness ; it had on its side the civil powers of the State ; and it deeply resented the imperious dictation and the supercilious haughtiness of the ruder Western Romans. Signs were not wanting of a disposition to resist the growing pretensions to interfere and to reprimand which were founded on the long-acknowledged primacy of Rome, and to assert the independence

¹ 'Sanctissima illa sedes, quæ universali Ecclesiæ jura sua transmittit.'
—John of Ravenna to Greg. *Ep.* iii. 57.

and real equality of the great Eastern thrones. Favouring circumstances and the mistakes of Popes might have wrecked the fortunes of the Papacy. The condition of Italy and of Rome was very precarious. It was not impossible that the Lombards might repeat the policy of the Vandals, and that the fate of Carthage might become that of her rival. A city surrounded by a rising flood of barbarism, not a half-tamed and friendly one like that of the Goths, but coarse and intolerant like that of the Vandals—a population unable to defend itself except behind its walls, and dependent on the sea for all its food—might (it is no extravagant supposition) have perished to make way for some Lombard capital. The Papacy felt itself in extreme danger 200 years later from the Lombards, when they were Catholics and had become half Italians ; and it called in the aid of the Franks to crush them. It cannot be thought to have been safe now, when they were still heathens or Arians, in the flush of their fierce and cruel conquest. An interruption now of the Papal history, just as the barbarians were settling in their new countries, in Gaul, in Britain, in Spain, might have seriously altered the course of events ; and even if, after such an interruption and eclipse, it had been resumed, other powers might have established themselves in the interval, both in the East and West, not easy, when once settled, to be dispossessed.

If it is not idle to attempt to trace influences and results in the tangled threads of history, Gregory's reign prevented this. Suppose that at this critical moment of jealousy, depression, and danger, there had been a succession of weak, or unfortunate, or wrong-headed, or corrupt Popes, the East and the Lombards between them might have irretrievably ruined the growing power of the Roman See. But, instead of this, the See was held for thirteen years by a man who impressed his character on the Church with a power unknown since S. Augustine, and even more widely than he, for in the East S. Augustine's name hardly counted for much, and Gregory's did. Instead of pompous feebleness and unenterprising routine, there was not only energy, purpose, unwearied industry in business, but there was a passion for justice, vigilant, fearless, impartial to small and great, a pervading conviction that righteous dealing and conscience in duty was above all zeal for the interests of a cause, a readiness for trouble and for change where reform and improvement called for them, a large and statesmanlike look abroad over the world to see where new efforts might be made to strengthen or to extend

the Kingdom of the Redeemer.¹ And this was the spectacle presented at Rome to a despairing world, when all other powers of order or of renovation seemed spent or paralysed. There sat a ruler who, if he was severe and peremptory, was serious and public-spirited in approbation and in judgment, in making not only bishops and clergy, but governors and magistrates, attend to their business and protect their people. What right he had to call upon Exarchs at Ravenna, or the Emperor's captains at Naples to do their duty, people did not curiously inquire, so long as in this neglected land there was some great person whom all revered, and who was not afraid to call anyone to account. There, at Rome, sat a representative of the love and compassion of the Apostles, whose ear was open to every suppliant, who felt every day that he arose from his own bed of pain for the infinite sufferings of the poor and miserable in the wild scene around him, who was ever ready to minister to their distress, whether it was brought to him in the cry of a multitude, or in the wrecked fortunes or pressing needs of a debtor, or of starving orphans. There sat a great landlord, who was not above entering into the petty details of long-accustomed fraud or exaction which made the lives of his distant tenants, whom he would never see, hopeless and wretched; one who raged against the unjust weight and the fraudulent bushel, and who thundered the anathemas of a council against those who removed landmarks and usurped fields on behalf of the patrimony of the Church. The Emperor was far off; what did Italians care that he was defending the Eastern borders against Persians or Avars; they only saw his useless soldiers and his burdensome and oppressive tax-gatherers. The Lombards were on the spot, in possession, or at the doors: was it to be war with them or peace? and neither Emperor nor Exarch could make up their mind, and they went on trifling with the dangerous intruders. It was no proper business of the Bishop of Rome to take on him to decide a public question of war or peace; and Gregory was Roman enough to wish for good vigorous war. But when there was no one to resolve or act, the Bishop of Rome accepted the responsibility. As he could not drive out the foreigners, he would have frank peace with them; he would make a separate truce; he would appeal to them as a Christian teacher; he would touch their sense of religion; he would

¹ 'Gregorius per procuratores ecclesiasticorum patrimoniorum, *velut Argus luminosissimus*, per totius mundi latitudinem suæ pastoralis sollicitudinis oculos circumtulit,' is the phrase of his biographer.—Joan. Diac. ii. 55. Cf. De Rozière's Introd. to *Lib. Diurn.* p. xxviii.

attract, convert, reclaim them. Doubtless he was interfering with the concerns of the Empire, with affairs of State, with a province which was not his; but he was doing the best he could to remedy the evils which made his countrymen and his flock miserable, and he was the only man who cared enough for them to make the attempt. He did what there was no one else to do amid—

‘The oppression of the tumult—wrath and scorn—
The tribulation, and the gleaming blades’—

the only one to try for that great crown, of being ‘the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in.’

We cannot be surprised that the Papacy came out of Gregory’s administration of it both firmer and stronger than before; that his letters were eagerly searched in subsequent emergencies, and by the compilers of the Canon Law, for rules of law and claims of right; that the precedents which he had set were appealed to and used in confirmation of a power which the circumstances of these troubled ages were continually inviting to extend itself. That power which afterwards advanced such enormous pretensions; that power which afterwards humbled emperors and kings, and interfered with the domestic concerns of the meanest peasant; that power which, after claiming to be supreme over law, ended by claiming to be supreme over faith and conscience and reason; that power, certainly, Gregory did not create, and did not know. He did not even lay the foundations of it, for he found them laid. But he certainly secured those foundations when they were in danger. He so administered the vast undefined powers supposed to be inherent in his See, that they appeared to be indispensable to the order, the good government and the hopes, not of the Church only, but of society. Great as were the strictly ecclesiastical prerogatives and duties of his place, great as he himself thought them, and jealous as he was of their undiminished integrity, he went out of his way to be more than a great Church governor: he passed beyond the sphere of purely religious and spiritual interests to give a splendid example of justice and righteousness in the civil and political government of men. To such a place power flowed and gathered itself by natural consequence. Take away that power, so widely and so fearlessly exercised, and what, indeed, was there in those days to awe the seething tumult of violence and passion? Disinterested and just, it was the only power which none but the bad need fear, the only power which men could wish to grow and

increase. In Gregory's hands it grew, not because he was ambitious, but because he was so just and good ; not because he aimed at increasing it, but because from his way of using it, it could not help increasing. All who suffered, all who smarted under fiscal oppression and fraud, all who trembled at the unjust judge or the barbarian's sword, all who believed in right, all who longed to eat their daily bread in peace and to die in their quiet homes—that is, all the long-suffering multitudes who did not live by war, but were ruined by it—could not but wish to see that power more and more respected, more and more active, more and more able to daunt the mighty ones of the earth. These multitudes looked up with confidence and sympathy to the great Bishop of Rome, who taught emperors their duty, and held up before exarchs the terrors of the day of judgment ; whose eye surveyed the whole barbarian world, and who assumed his right to give counsel or warning or praise to the distant kings of the nations—to Brunchild in Gaul, to Æthelbert in Kent, to Recared in Spain. No one was afraid of increasing and enlarging the claims of the Bishop of Rome : why should they? the conquerors, after all, trusted in their swords, and to the conquered he was their best protection from those swords. The virtues of the man, and the disorder of the times, when the old powers of the world were failing, and the new had not yet come, made such an authority as his, if it was to be had, like a heaven-sent compensation for all that had perished in the wreck of the Empire. Why should we doubt that it was a heavenly-sent compensation ; that it was ordered by God's Providence, in mercy to men, in times of confusion and change? The power which Gregory had and left grew naturally out of the necessities of the times. But when power has been grandly and beneficently used, men are apt to think that it has established a title to continuance. And so it passed, in time, strengthened by his example, and increasing its demands as it was worse used, to the nominees of the Counts of Tusculum, and to the Popes of Avignon and the Great Schism. It was held to warrant the victory of Cannossa, the humiliation of John of England, the Bulls of Indulgences. It grew up, as it is the way of institutions to grow up ; it served its time, as we see in the case of other institutions. The use which Gregory made of it, and the conditions of his time, more than justified all that it was then. His own use of it, his own example, and the changed conditions of later centuries, to say nothing of its intervening history, are amply sufficient to justify us in believing that its use has passed away.

ART. VII.—THE DAWN OF THE PAPAL
MONARCHY.

1. *Petri Privilegium : Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese of Westminster.* By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, D.D. (London, 1871.)
2. *The See of S. Peter.* By T. W. ALLIES, M.A. (London, 1850.)
3. *Conciliengeschichte.* Von J. C. HEFELE. Second Edition. (Freiburg, 1873-77.)
4. *Cathedra Petri : a Political History of the Great Latin Patriarchate.* By THOMAS GREENWOOD. (London, 1856.)
5. *History of the Popes.* By ARCHIBALD BOWER, Esq. Edited by S. C. COX. (Philadelphia, 1844.)
6. *Leo the Great.* By the Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A. (London, 1880.)

THE fifth century, itself the transitional period between the ancient and the modern world, more fitly here placed than at the later epoch of Karl the Great, was also the time when, from a variety of causes, chiefly political, the vague and indeterminate influence and priority of the Roman Pontiff began to be transformed into a monarchy over Western Christendom, at first partly constitutional, but gradually freeing itself from all checks save that of its own bureaucracy, and assuming the form of a despotism. The collapse of the Imperial authority in the West, as each puppet Emperor rose and fell at the bidding of some foreign ruler more powerful than he, the distance and relative weakness of the occupant of the Byzantine throne, the anarchy of society everywhere as the old order and civilization was breaking up and the new deposits of alien races were slowly crystallizing into regular polities and kingdoms, made some central unifying and statical influence a prime necessity ; and a variety of causes united to lift the Pope into the vacant seat. The modern Papacy is due to no Divine charter, no Imperial donation, not even to an inevitable theological development, but to a series of political accidents, so to speak, bearing a certain imperfect analogy to the process which in recent times has set Prussia in the chief place among the Great Powers of Europe. But in this paper, as in its precursors, the aim will be not so much to

VOL. XII.—NO. XXIII.

N

exhibit proofs of the exercise of Papal authority, which have been even superabundantly dwelt on by Roman controversialists, as to record those protests in act or word which demonstrate that the Church at large was conscious that its rights were being steadily encroached on, and that no sacred charter, no immemorial prescription, could be truly alleged as the warrant for the new claims, almost as successfully, as they were persistently, put forward. It is necessary to repeat this warning, in order to escape the charge of unfair dealing with the evidence, certain to be brought by such as either do not fully understand or are unconvinced by the line of argument, and to point out that the matter is analogous to a pedigree lawsuit for a peerage and estates. It is no part of the task of the counsel who argues against the claimant to deal with the whole genealogy, and to discuss the career of each successor in the line. His work is done if he establish the existence of serious gaps and flaws, at any points in the course of descent, which disprove the title or even the legitimacy of the claimant. It is of no avail for such a claimant to prove the unbroken regularity of transmission for a dozen generations, if the marriage of his own father or grandfather be precisely the moot point on which his right of succession turns. And, in like manner, examples of wide and powerful influence exercised by the Popes, notably in the West, can be adduced by the hundred, but are rarely to the point, because they are in no respect differentiated from the action of other powerful bishops. A single illustration of this principle may serve once for all. Few arguments, then, have been more frequently urged by Ultramontane controversialists than the fact of the deposition of bishops by the Pope, as establishing his claim to be supreme ruler of the Church, and the source of all episcopal jurisdiction. But in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon it is expressly stated that S. John Chrysostom, 'going into Asia, deposed fifteen bishops and consecrated others in their stead.'¹ Thus the matter sinks at once to the level of ordinary patriarchal jurisdiction, and is of no more avail as proof than the title of 'Vicar of Christ,' which, though now restricted by Latin Christendom to the Pope, was formerly a title common to all bishops.²

The first important event in the Church history of the fifth century which illustrates this ambiguity is the appeal

¹ Ἰωάννης δεκαπέντε ἐπισκόπους καθείλεν, ἀπελθὼν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ, καὶ ἐχειροτόνησεν ἄλλους ἀντ' αὐτῶν.—*Conc. Chalced.* Act II.

² S. Basil, M., *Const. Monast.* 22; S. Ambros. in 1 Cor. xi. 10; *Quæst. V. et N. T.* 127, in App. Opp. S. Aug.

made to the Roman Pontiff, Innocent I., by S. John Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, when the conspiracy against him, begun and matured through the vindictive malice of the Empress Eudoxia, was running its course. It is unnecessary here to describe in detail the circumstances which ended in S. Chrysostom's exile and death, or Innocent's honourable share in defending his cause, which proved very useful to the prestige of Rome; but two incidents, which have been used by Baronius and Bellarmine as proving the supreme appellate jurisdiction of the Roman See, call for mention. In the first place, then, Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, who was the principal tool of the Empress against S. Chrysostom, and who presided over the Synod of the Oak, in which sentence of deposition was passed against the aged saint, sent an envoy to Rome with a letter to Pope Innocent announcing the decree. Happily, Eusebius, a deacon of the Church of Constantinople, who chanced to be in Rome at the time, and knew something of the character of Theophilus, hearing of the matter, at once warned the Pope to be on his guard, and to wait for more information before returning an answer. Three days later a deputation of four bishops from Constantinople arrived in Rome, bringing three letters for Innocent: one from S. Chrysostom himself, another from forty prelates who adhered to him, and a third from the clergy of Constantinople.

As regards these events, the first-named, the notice sent by Theophilus, is not, even on the face of it, an appeal at all. It does not submit the sentence of the Synod of the Oak to the Pope, asking for his ratification, but simply acquaints him with it as a fact which it concerned him, as the other bishops of Christendom, to know. If Innocent, on his part, had happened to depose any bishop, especially one occupying an important see, it would have been just as much his duty to send notice of the fact to Theophilus, that he might give the necessary warning throughout his patriarchate, lest the condemned person might be inadvertently received to communion by any bishop or priest there.

But the disproof supplied by S. Chrysostom's share in the transaction is more explicit than this. His letter is fortunately still extant, and a copy in Palladius¹ informs us that it was addressed not to Innocent singly, but also to Venerius of Milan and Chromatius of Aquileia, the two sees then next in rank to Rome in Western Christendom. And what he asks is not that the Pope, in virtue of his sovereignty, shall decide the cause and thereby end it, but that all the three bishops may

¹ *Dial.* c. 2.

jointly write, and declare by their authority all the acts of Theophilus and his faction, done in S. Chrysostom's absence, and when he did not refuse any fair trial, to be of no effect, but inherently null and void ; that the censures of the Church may be fulminated against the offenders ; and that Chrysostom and the bishops of his party may be restored to their sees. The next clause shows how this last was to be brought about ; not by the mere issue of a Papal rescript, but by pressure being brought to bear on the Court of Byzantium to grant a new trial, under reasonable conditions and before an impartial tribunal, to which S. Chrysostom promises to submit. The Pope's reply to the saint is lost ; but Theodore, the Roman deacon, has preserved its substance for us, which is, briefly, that he intended to treat the decree of Theophilus as null and void, and recommended the summoning of a new Council of Eastern and Western bishops, such as could have no fault found with its constitution, to try the case afresh. His letter to Theophilus of Alexandria, however, is extant ; and therein he bids him await the convening of another Synod, and therein argue his case on the lines of the Nicene canons and decrees, 'which alone the Roman Church acknowledges ;' since, if he could win his cause in that fashion, it would make the justice of his plea clear and indisputable.

No plainer admission is necessary that the Pope knew that the final decision did not rest with him ; and that whatever right of interference the comity of the Church Universal might allow to his eminent rank, nothing like supreme authority was vested in his person.

And this practical abdication of claims as of right over the East comes all the more saliently forward when contrasted with the very large demands which the same Pope made almost simultaneously on some of the Western Churches. The vast diocese of Eastern Illyricum had been gradually brought under the Roman obedience, and had submitted to the visitatorial authority of four successive Pontiffs. In 414 some of its bishops, who had applied to Innocent earlier for guidance on some points of discipline, wrote to him a second time on the same topic, not having carried out his former directions. He replied very austere, saying, 'I had previously taken your doubts into consideration, and now I adjudge it to be an insult to the Apostolic See that any hesitation should have occurred in a matter referred to and decided by that See, *which is the head of all Churches.*'¹ Again, writing in 415 to Exuperius,

¹ Hardouin, *Conc. i.* 1015. It must suffice to say here, once for all, that the dealings of successive Popes with Eastern Illyricum were the

Bishop of Toulouse, he lays down the maxim that in all cases of difficulty and doubt or conflicting usage, it is the bounden duty of all Churches to resort to and abide by the decision of the Apostolic See, as the fountain head of genuine tradition.¹ And in a decretal addressed to Decentius of Gubbio in 414 he alleges that it is notorious that S. Peter and his successors alone constituted bishops and founded Churches in all the Gauls, in Spain, Africa, Sicily and the neighbouring islands; and that whatever is the local Church usage at Rome is therefore sufficient for the instruction of Decentius as to what he should do.

This claim, of which no whisper is discoverable earlier, attests the gradual manufacture of a factitious tradition at Rome, and a very long stride forward in the Papal pretensions, being the first germ of the later assertion that Rome is the mother, as well as the mistress, of all Churches. The Pope's own singular lapse of memory in the matter, if no harsher judgment be passed upon him, is shown by his entire omission of S. Paul as having had any share in building up Western Christendom, and by his claim over Gaul, whose evangelization was universally admitted in his time, as in ours, to be due to the Church of Smyrna, through the agency of S. Polycarp, whose envoys planted the Church of Lyons. And with reference to his assertion that the customs of the Roman Church should by right prevail as the rule at Gubbio and everywhere else, there is a special aptness in quoting the contemporary letter of S. Jerome to Evagrius or Evangelus:—

‘If you look for authority, the whole world is greater than the City [of Rome]. Wherever a bishop is, whether at Rome or at Gubbio, at Constantinople or at Reggio, at Alexandria or at Thanis, he is of the same dignity and the same priesthood; the power of wealth or the lowness of poverty does not make a bishop higher or lower, but all are the successors of the Apostles. . . . But you say that at Rome a priest is ordained on the testimony of a deacon. Why do you quote to me the custom of a single city? Why do you urge the small number [of the Roman deacons], as if it were amongst the laws of the Church?’

chief means whereby precedents were created for the institution of Papal vicars or resident legates, for evoking appeals before these vicars in their capacity as representatives of the Pope, and for transmitting all more important matters to Rome itself for final decision: all which steps for the advancement of the Papal prerogative were taken in this province earlier than elsewhere; and, from local causes, with none of the checks and resistance which met the Popes in Africa and Gaul when encroaching on local rights.

¹ Hardouin, *Conc.* i. 1003.

However, as Gubbio did lie within the limits of the Roman patriarchate, there is some palliation for Innocent's attitude towards its bishop. No such excuse can be alleged in favour of his dexterous transformation of an ordinary notice from the African Churches into a precedent of submission. The Synods of Carthage and of Milevis, held in 416 under the influence of S. Augustine, had formally condemned Pelagianism as a heresy, and sent the customary notice to the Pope, asking for his ratification of the decrees. This was not merely the usual, but the necessary, proceeding, according to the ecclesiastical laws of the time, that no part of the Christian commonwealth might appear to act apart from and independently of the others; only, such notice of conciliar proceedings was sent to every great Church, and was as much due from the Roman Pontiff, when any Synod had been held within his local jurisdiction, as from any other authority to him. But Innocent treated this customary act of comity as a special act of submission to the Roman See, in spite of the very clear, though complimentary, diplomatic language of the African missives, which ran in the following terms. The Fathers of Carthage say, 'We have anathematized Pelagius and Coelestius . . . Sir and Brother (*Domine Frater*), and have thought fit to inform you of it, that to the decrees of our mediocrity might be added the authority of the Apostolic See.' And towards the close of their letter, less ambiguously, after mentioning the grounds of their decree, they add, 'And even if it have seemed to your venerable self that Pelagius was rightly acquitted by the episcopal action in the East, yet this error and impiety, which has now so many abettors scattered everywhere, ought to be anathematized by the authority of the Apostolic See.'¹ Here, then, amidst much polite deference of expression, is a very plain hint to the Pope that his judgment so far has been erroneous—(in point of fact, he had let Pelagius teach as he pleased in Rome itself for several years, so that the spread of the heresy was due to his negligence or ignorance, unchecked as it was till, removing from Rome about 412, Pelagius encountered S. Jerome in Palestine and Coelestius S. Augustine in Africa)—and a still plainer intimation of what his duty should lead him to do. There could, therefore, be no doubt in Innocent's mind as to the true character of the message. Nevertheless, in his reply, he adroitly assumes that they were consulting him in order to obtain his permission to validate their acts, and that they were now submitting their decision to his final

¹ S. August. Ep. 175.

approval. Some extracts from his two letters to Carthage and Milevis will best illustrate the matter :—

'You have acted in the true method, holding to the pattern of ancient tradition, and being mindful of Church discipline, in determining to refer the matter to our judgment, knowing what is due to the Apostolic See—seeing that all of us [Popes] set in this place desire to follow the Apostle himself—whence the episcopate itself and all the authority of its name has flowed. . . . But you have not thought fit to trample under foot those institutions of the Fathers which you guard with your priestly office, decreed by them not of human but of the Divine will, that whatever may be done in provinces, however separate or remote, they should not account concluded till it had come to the knowledge of this See, that every righteous finding might be established with its whole authority, and that all other Churches might thence take what they should teach, &c., just as all waters issue from their native fountain. . . . You have diligently and wisely consulted the sanctuary [*arcana*] of Apostolic honour (that honour, I say, to which, apart from its external manifestation, belongs the care of all the Churches) as to what opinion should be held on difficult matters, following therein the ancient rule, which, as you know, the whole world has always observed in respect of me. But I pass over all this, for I am sure it has not escaped your wisdom ; for what was it which you decided by your action save that you knew that throughout all the provinces replies and questions always issue from the Apostolic fount ? And especially as often as a question of faith is under discussion, I suppose that all our brethren and fellow-bishops ought not to refer save to Peter—that is, the author of their own name and dignity—as you, beloved, have now referred it : a thing which may be for the common profit of all Churches throughout the world.'¹

What makes the audacity of these assertions more startling is the fact that the two letters from which they are extracted were addressed to the bishops of those very Mauretanian and Numidian Churches which in S. Cyprian's time had twice rejected by a unanimous conciliar vote and decree the judgment of Pope Stephen on a question of doctrine and discipline. Innocent, consequently, not only knew that his statements were false, but that all the recipients of his letters would know it too. Nevertheless he acted on a principle which has been all but invariably followed by his successors, that of making the very largest demands, far in advance of the rightful claims of his See, on the chance of their being allowed, in which case they would be all clear gain ; while, even if rejected, the mere fact of having made them would serve so far as a precedent, that the demand next time would cease to arouse attention as a startling novelty, and the documents might also be uti-

¹ S. August. Epistt. 181, 182.

lized in places where the fact of their having been challenged and rejected could be passed over in silence, and it might be taken for granted that they had enjoyed their intended authority. At the risk of prolixity, it is desirable to cite some other letters of this Pope, albeit of much less importance, as helping to show the attitude he adopted, and its incompatibility with his own discharge of his high functions, assuming them to be all that he represented. One is a letter of consolation he addressed to S. Jerome when the Pelagians had burnt him out of his monastery at Bethlehem, and attacked the house of SS. Paula and Eustochium, towards the close of which the Pope says, 'If you will lodge an open and manifest accusation against any persons, I will either appoint competent judges, or, if there be anything else prompter or more zealous which can be done by us, I will make no delay, beloved son.' ¹ Here, knowing, as he must have done, S. Jerome's strong local attachment to the Roman See, exhibited long before in his conduct towards Pope Damasus, Innocent suggests to him the idea of bringing the cause out of the only jurisdiction which had a right to try it, that of the Bishop of Jerusalem, and to evoke it to Rome, before judges with no claim whatever. Another is his letter (sent, it would seem, by the same messenger) to John of Jerusalem himself, who was shrewdly suspected of knowing too much about the Pelagians' attack on S. Jerome, then in disfavour with him by reason of his conflict with the Origenists. This is couched in terms of dignified rebuke, well deserved, no doubt, though somewhat too much in the tone of a superior addressing his inferior, albeit the title 'brother' is used; but there is not a word in it implying any canonical rights over the See of Jerusalem, or more than the duty of remonstrating against a grievous wrong which had been permitted, and seemingly not punished, by the very person whose care it should have been to preserve order. Taken together, the letters show a design to push covertly that which could not be demanded openly. A third letter, somewhat earlier in date, is in reply to one from S. Augustine and others, asking for information about the Pelagians in Rome, where the heresiarch had long resided. There is a variant in this letter of S. Augustine's, in one text of which we read, 'We have heard that in the city of Rome, where he [Pelagius] lived a long time, there are persons who favour him for different reasons, some, because they assert that you have encouraged such teaching (*vos talia persuasisse*

¹ Baron. *Ann.* A.D. 416, xxxiii.

perhibent), more, because they do not believe that he holds such views at all.' The other text, which is the Benedictine, reads, 'Some, because he is alleged to have so persuaded them' (*quia eis talia persuasisse perhibetur*). Baronius, who follows the former of these readings, treats the clause as an example of heretical calumny, striving to prop itself on the support of the Apostolic See. The reply of Innocent is as follows:—

'Whether these [Pelagians] be in the city, as we know nothing about it, we can neither affirm nor deny it; and even if they be there, they have never had the boldness either to defend him when he has preached such doctrines, or to assert them in the presence of any of us, nor is it easy in such a crowded population to lay hold of or identify any person.'¹

No apter comment could be made on his claim to be the ultimate referee and supreme teacher of all Christendom than this humiliating confession that he knew nothing about the principal heresy of his time, which had been growing and spreading at its will under his very eyes, in his own city of Rome. He may be acquitted of all connivance at it, but not of either being too ignorant of theology to recognize its bearing till he was instructed by the African prelates; or too remiss in discharging the duty of banishing all false doctrine from the limits of his diocese. It has been necessary to dwell at some length on the career of Innocent, because he is in truth the real founder of the Papal monarchy (though the greater personal eminence of Leo I. has caused that fact to be too much obscured), and it is in his language first that we find a direct connexion between the alleged Petrine succession and the Primacy of Christendom asserted, and the claims of Rome based directly on its being the See of Peter, and on Peter himself, not Christ, as being the prime source of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction: a view Innocent had put forward as early as 414 in a letter to Alexander of Antioch, in which he alleges the dignity of that city in the Christian hierarchy to be solely due to its having been for a time S. Peter's See, and that it yielded to Rome only because S. Peter ended there what he did but begin at Antioch. 'But,' as Bower shrewdly observes, 'if it be true, as Innocent pretends, that the See of Antioch owed its dignity to S. Peter, and not to the city, how will he account for its being ranked under that of Alexandria, which was neither founded nor had ever been honoured by that Apostle?'²

¹ Baron. *Ann.* 406, xii.

² *Hist. of the Popes*, i. 143.

If these two great claims made by Innocent had been suffered to pass for any length of time unquestioned, doubtless they might have acquired prescription, but the African Churches met the demand by enacting in 418 the canon which stands as No. CXXV. in the *Codex Ecclesiæ Africanæ*, sentencing to excommunication all bishops, priests, and deacons who should appeal beyond seas instead of contenting themselves with the decisions of African primates and councils; while the still larger claim was estopped by Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon in 451.

But whereas Innocent had at any rate pronounced definitely against the Pelagian heresy, and approved the African decrees, his immediate successor, Zosimus, who attained the pontificate in 417, reversed this decision on the personal appeal of Cœlestius, whose confession of faith, in which he denied original sin to be a doctrine of the Church, the Pope declared orthodox and Catholic, sending a letter thereupon to Aurelius of Carthage and the other African bishops, directing the accusers of Cœlestius and Pelagius either to appear at Rome within a month to disprove the former's confession, or to let the matter drop finally, and in the meantime to abstain from all such 'captious questionings and idle disputes' (*tendiculas quæstionum et inepta certamina*), calling on them to act thus in virtue of the authority of the Apostolic See.¹ He followed this letter up with another, in which he summarily acquitted Pelagius of all blame, nay, praised him highly, and sharply rebuked the African bishops for listening to such pests (*turbines Ecclesiæ vel procellæ*) as Heros and Lazarus, the Gallic bishops who had acted as the accusers of the two heresiarchs, and whom the Pope reviles in the coarsest language, declaring further that the Apostolic See had specially excommunicated them, but found no fault in the two accused, who up to that time, 'though censured by unjust judges, have never been separated from our body nor from Catholic verity.'²

S. Augustine was not the man to be put down by bluster of this sort, but at once procured the assembling of an African council of 214 bishops at Carthage in February 418, which unanimously renewed the condemnation of Pelagius and Cœlestius, informing Zosimus that they adhered to the decision of his predecessor Innocent; while yet another council of 225 bishops—if it be not rather the same reassembled after prorogation—met in May of the same year, and again condemning the Pelagians, further enacted the canon against

¹ Baron. *Ann.* 417. xix.

² Baron. *Ann.* 417. xxv.-xxix.

transmarine appeals just referred to, and obviously directed in opposition to the Roman claims.

Whether the Pope's action be regarded as that of the claimant to be the teacher, or as that of the claimant to be the ruler, of all Christendom, this episode is equally fatal to the pretensions of his See: for he was compelled by the force of public opinion, and still more by the terrors of an Imperial decree against the Pelagians, to retract his former decision, and to anathematize and excommunicate both Pelagius and Cœlestius.

S. Augustine's comment on the matter, after this consummation had been reached, is curious. It was his desire, as that of all the leading theologians of his school, to hush up as far as possible the scandal of the Papal error, and to establish the influence of the Roman Chair, if for no other reason than that its great power made it the best available agency for putting pressure on the civil authority in the West in any ecclesiastical crisis. Accordingly he palliates the conduct of Zosimus, ascribing his acquittal of Cœlestius not to approval of that teacher's doctrine as Catholic, but to his confidence in the professed willingness of Cœlestius to condemn anything erroneous which might be found therein. And then he uses these words, which form a noteworthy comment on the infallibility dogma:—

‘But if—which Heaven forbid (*quod absit*)—there was a decision at that time in the Roman Church concerning Cœlestius or Pelagius, to the effect that their opinions, which Pope Innocent had condemned in and with them, were pronounced approved and tenable, the result of that would be to brand the stigma of apostasy (*prævaricationis*) on the Roman clergy.’¹

But, as precisely this very thing had happened, the Saint's censure remains.

The later struggle of Pope Zosimus with the African Church in the affair of Apiarius, in which he was again defeated, has been already discussed in a former paper of this series, wherein the canons of the Councils are examined;² nor was he more successful in an attempt to exercise jurisdiction over the bishops of Gaul, when he strove to set aside the decrees of the Council of Turin by adjudging the primacy of Gallia Narbonensis to Patroclus, Bishop of Arles, and endeavoured to depose or excommunicate Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles, who steadily resisted him, and held possession

¹ *Ad. Bonif.* ii. 5.

² *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1879, p. 5.

of his see in despite of the Papal edicts, being recognized till his death by the Bishops of Gaul and of Africa. In the course of this dispute Zosimus made one dangerous admission, in that he alleged that the metropolitan dignity and jurisdiction had been so unalterably annexed to the See of Arles by the decrees of the Fathers and councils that it was beyond even the power and authority of the Roman See to transfer them to any other; albeit in his own action he was contravening, as just remarked, the decrees of Turin. He died shortly after penning the letter which contains this statement.¹ It suffices here to say that the contest between Rome and Carthage continued under his successors Boniface I. and Celestine I.² The heads of the letter addressed by the Council of Carthage in 424 to Pope Celestine have already been summarized (*u. s.*); but one of its clauses is such a peremptory challenge of the whole later theory of Papal supremacy and infallibility that it deserves a verbal citation. After repudiating the notion that any special privilege of the Roman Church, entitling it to interfere with other Churches, existed at all, or could be pressed without violating the Nicene canons, the Fathers add that these Nicene canons, providing for the trial of spiritual causes within each province without further appeal, were most wisely and righteously drafted,

'especially because permission was given to everyone who found fault with any judgment of the arbiters (*cognitorum*) to appeal to the councils of his province, or even to a general council, *unless per-*

¹ Bower, *Hist. of Popes*, i. 160. 'Quod contra statuta Patrum et Sancti Trophimi reverentiam, qui primus Metropolitanus Arelatensis civitatis ex hac sede directus est, concedere, vel mutare, *ne hujus quidem sedis possit auctoritas*.'—Zos. *Epist. ad Episc. Vienn. et Narbon.*, ap. Baronium, *Ann.* 417, xlviii.

² Boniface I. is one of those very questionable links in the chain of the Roman succession which make its canonical regularity most doubtful. There was a double election, and his competitor, Eulalius, Archdeacon of Rome, was actually proclaimed and enthroned in due form as Pope. Symmachus, Prætorian Prefect of Rome, reported to the Emperor Honorius that the latter was the valid election. Boniface attempted, like Damasus, to force his way in by help of a mob, and that in the teeth of an Imperial edict declaring that he was the intruding claimant. He appealed, and pending the rehearing, the Emperor decreed that neither candidate should enter Rome. Eulalius, who seems not to have known of this decree, which even the Prefect had not received, transgressed its provisions by entering the city as Pope. He and his unarmed friends were speedily assailed by an armed mob of Boniface's faction; but the Emperor held him accountable for the riot, and decreed his expulsion and the recognition of Boniface as the true Pope. No trial on the merits ever took place; and the friends of Eulalius never accepted the Imperial decree as valid, nor would communicate with Boniface.—Baron. *Ann.* 419, xxxiii.-xli.

chance there be somebody who can believe that our God might possibly inspire any one single person with the power of righteous judgment, and deny it to countless priests assembled in council.'

And then they go on to point out the practical inconvenience of appeals beyond sea, as regards the production of witnesses ; while, on the other hand, no former council which they had been able to find had ever empowered the Pope to send legates *a latere* to try cases on the spot.¹ And they close by implying very clearly that in commissioning his legate Faustinus to force on the African Church certain canons [of Sardica] as though Nicene canons, he was lending himself to what he certainly knew to be false;² because when his predecessor

¹ 'Nam ut aliqui tamquam tuæ sanctitatis latere mittantur, nulla invenimus Patrum synodo constitutum.'

² When this point was referred to previously (*Church Quarterly Review*, April 1879, p. 3), the authenticity of these Canons, as at any rate genuine enactments of the Council of Sardica in 347, was assumed, and they were discussed on their merits. But this is a fit place to say that no satisfactory evidence of such authenticity is producible, and that there is some reason for suspecting them to be a sheer fabrication at Rome. For no hint of their existence occurs till they were falsely alleged in 419 as Nicene canons by the Papal Legate at Carthage, while the African Bishops contented themselves with disproving that one fiction, but evidently knew nothing else whatever about them, not being able to assign them even to Sardica, obviously because they had never heard of them before; whereas the invariable rule of the time was to send the acts and canons of synods of more than provincial character round to all the great Churches for approval; so that the Sardican canons, if genuine at all, must have been known at Carthage, at any rate by 424, after attention there had been drawn to them five years previously, and a consequent search made, supposing no earlier information to have been accessible. What is more, there is entire silence on this head in the Acts of Constantinople in 381, and of Chalcedon in 451, albeit both dealing with the question of appellate jurisdiction; nor does S. Athanasius refer to these canons. And though S. Augustine's silence may be explained away on the ground that he mixes up the Council of Sardica with the seceding Arian synod of Philippopolis, no such excuse accounts for the equal silence of SS. Basil and Epiphanius, and of the three great ecclesiastical historians of the time, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, none of whom know of any Sardican document except the synodical epistle. Seeing that the canons, if genuine, altered for the West the system of appeals which had prevailed in the Church up to that time, based as it was on the rule of the civil code that all cases should be ended where they originated, their legal and historical importance is such that this unbroken silence is nearly unaccountable. Nor is any example known of their having been avowedly acted on anywhere in the West; precisely where the canons of the Council must have been known and in many provincial archives, whereas they are cited only in Papal missives to Churches whose Bishops were not at Sardica. And as their Nicene character was alleged for the *fourth* time so late as 484 by Felix II. in his dispute with Acacius of Constantinople, it is obvious that this persistence in one falsehood makes the presence of another more likely. No one at Rome could have

Boniface had made the same attempt, envoys had been sent to him from Carthage, bearing authentic copies of the Nicene canons, attested by Cyril of Alexandria and Atticus of Constantinople, from whose archives they had been procured.

The next matter of importance to be considered is the assembling of the Third General Council at Ephesus in 431. As in the two preceding cases, it was by Imperial, not by Papal, fiat that it was convened. Theodosius II., on November 19, 430, addressed a circular letter in his own name and in that of his cousin, Valentinian III., Emperor of the West, to all metropolitans, bidding them assemble at Ephesus by Pentecost 431. He seems to have done this chiefly on the petition of Nestorius; and the very fact of this council being convened at all is an emphatic refutation of the Papal claims, simply because Nestorius, whose teaching was to be the sub-

honestly believed them to be Nicene, because they expressly name Pope Julius, who did not begin to sit till 337, twelve years after the Council of Nice (a few Latin MSS. have *Silvester* here, an obvious correction). The policy of urging them as canons of a great Council like Sardica, when it proved impossible to gain credit for them as Nicene, is so evident that its not being adopted prompts a suspicion that they were well known at Rome not to be decrees of any council whatever, so that any strict inquiry must tend to the same result, and that being so, it was more politic to keep up the Nicene claim. No Greek text is known earlier than the sixth century, and a very suspicious circumstance marks the three oldest Latin texts, the *Prisca*, that of Dionysius Exiguus, and the true Isidore. These, as a rule, give independent and various translations of all Greek canons, but they agree verbally for the so-called Sardican canons. The inference is that there was never a Greek original at all, but only a Latin forgery. If so, the whole fabric of Papal appeals falls, for it has no other basis. On the other hand, the following arguments may be adduced in favour of the genuineness of these canons, as enactments of Sardica:—(1) The Greek silence may be due to lack of interest in the doings of a Council almost entirely Western and Latin (as Sardica was after the secession of the Eastern bishops to Philippopolis), and on a point of discipline affecting the West alone; (2) There is a difficulty in understanding how, if they be a late fourth-century forgery, they came to be connected with Sardica in any way, when it would have been just as easy to have given them a Nicene form and history; whereas the Latin view of Sardica as an appendage of Nicæa (much as the Trullan synod was later regarded by the East as united to the Fifth and Sixth General Councils, whence its title of 'Quinisext') accounts for a quite innocent error at first as to the source of its canons; while, if they be a fifth-century forgery, their appellate system is too cumbrous and indirect to fit in with the Papalism then in vogue at Rome, which had already gone far beyond the limitations of these canons; (3) Their association with Hosius as their proposer is unlikely to have occurred to a forger; (4) They are congruous, in tone and scope, with the condition of things at their alleged date, but scarcely with earlier or later times; (5) The unity of the Latin texts points, indeed, to a Latin original, not to a Greek one, but then the Council was in all respects a Latin synod, and this point is so far in favour of genuineness.

ject of debate, had already been condemned and deposed by Pope Celestine, on August 11, 430, in a council at Rome, accepted as the voice of the whole Western Church. Clearly, if a Papal sentence be final, there was no reason, and even no room, for a synod to reopen the matter, or so much as to affirm the Pope's decision. But no such claim appears in Celestine's own letter to the Council, in which he expressly says that the Divine commission to teach had come equally to all Bishops by hereditary right, that the command is a general one, and to be executed by the joint and co-ordinate action of all.¹ Two incidents, however, mark the growth of Papal power since the Council of Nicæa. In the first place, he sent two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, together with Philip, a priest, as his legates; and next, they were expressly instructed, while giving a general support to Cyril of Alexandria, the president of the Council, to uphold in all things the authority of the Roman See.² Another able stroke of policy was that Celestine, albeit having his legates in attendance, entrusted to Cyril his own proxy, thereby making it arguable that it was in virtue of that proxy, and for no other reason, that Cyril presided. But this, albeit relied on by modern controversialists, failed of its alleged effect, not only because no power of being or naming the president had ever been entrusted to the Pope, who thus could not delegate what he did not enjoy, and also because no instructions were given to the actual legates to treat Cyril as their chief in that sense, but also because Cyril happened to absent himself from some of the sessions, and on those occasions his place was filled by Juvenal of Jerusalem (not yet a patriarchal see), instead of by one of the Papal legates, who would have naturally occupied the presidency, as next in order, had Cyril sat merely as proxy for Celestine; though, without doubt, his holding the proxy did give him greater influence in the synod, as may be gathered from the brief references which Evagrius, Zonaras, and Photius make to the fact that he acted for Celestine as well as for himself. And it is just possible that it was this new precedent which led Gelasius of Cyzicus to assume that Hosius of Cordova held a similar proxy at Nicæa for Pope Sylvester.

That Nestorius and the bishops of his party were nevertheless summoned to take their seats in the Council shows that their ecclesiastical position was not held to be affected by the Roman decrees; but the Papal legates, by a brilliant

¹ Mansi, *Conc.* iv. 1283.

² Hardouin, *Conc.* i. 1347.

stratagem, succeeded in more than recovering all the ground lost in this wise. Knowing Cyril's temper, and being assured that, so long as Nestorius was condemned somehow, the Egyptian patriarch would not scrutinize too minutely the terms in which this might be done, all three of them in concert alleged that they and the Council generally were merely executing the decree of Pope Celestine, which the legate Philip alleged to be in effect that of Peter, 'Exarch and Head of the Apostles, Pillar and Foundation of the Church Catholic, . . . who even to the present time lives and exercises these judicial powers in his successors.'¹ However, the actual sentence of deposition had been passed upon Nestorius in quite different terms before the Roman legates arrived, and they did but assent thereto; while the synodical epistles of the Council to the Emperor and the Pope contain no such admissions: for in the former epistle all that is stated is that, as the Western Churches agree with the doctrine enunciated at Ephesus by the Eastern, the sentence pronounced may be taken as the common judgment of all the Christian world; and the Pope is told that 'we commanded that the sentence which your Holiness pronounced should remain firm;' a phrase which necessarily implies their right of annulling it, had it pleased them so to do; while in neither letter is there any recognition of the legatine character in Cyril's person, but only in that of the three Roman envoys. And S. Cyril's own teaching on the Apostolic and episcopal offices is still extant in abundance, proving amply that he held no such views as those which the legate Philip had advanced, but regarded the Apostles as enjoying a parity of rank and authority, and himself as Celestine's equal and colleague, albeit lower in precedence, as occupying a less important see.²

Another circumstance, belonging to this same year 431, has an importance which must have been quite unobservable at that time, and indeed till the Jansenist controversy arose: namely, that Pope Celestine then addressed a letter to the

¹ Labbe, *Conc.* iii., *Conc. Eph.* Act. ii. col. 1147-1158. An Ultramontane argument has been based on a phrase which occurs more than once in these Acts, and is to the effect that the Fathers of the Council, jointly with the legates, admitted themselves to be merely 'executing' the decree already finally pronounced by Celestine. As a fact, the phrase, when tested, proves to refer to the legates exclusively, and merely denotes their discharge of their legatine commission, for the verb ἐκτελέειν and the noun ἐκτελεστικός are used only by the legates when speaking of themselves, or by the Council in the same restricted sense.

² As there are copious citations to this effect from S. Cyril accumulated in Mr. Allies's *Church of England Cleared from the Charge of Schism*, 2nd edition, pp. 206-212, it is needless to reproduce them here.

Bishops of Gaul, urging them to uphold the doctrines of S. Augustine on grace and free-will, and to silence all opposition thereto. In order to make quite clear what he meant, he appended to his letter nine articles, which directly maintain the very tenets condemned by the Bull *Unigenitus* of Clement XI. in 1713. This conflict of infallibilities is so direct and explicit, that an attempt has been made to evade it by denying Celestine's authorship of the articles in question; but the external evidence is too precise, seeing that they are ascribed to him by Dionysius Exiguus in his collection of decretals and canons made in the sixth century, by Petrus Diaconus in 519, and by Cresconius in his *Concordia Canonum* in the seventh century; while they were never disputed till their authenticity became inconvenient.¹

With the accession of Leo the Great to the Papal Chair a new era sets in. That eminent man is not only the first to formulate Papalism as the essential principle of the Church, derived by full devolution from S. Peter, but he occupies a remarkable place on two other grounds. He was, on the one hand, the first of the Popes who can be justly entitled a theologian (with the one possible exception of his predecessor Dionysius²), and who helped to teach Christendom, instead of having to borrow his instruction from outsiders, or to err grievously in default of such instruction, as was the case with too many of his predecessors. On the other hand, he was the innovator who began the usage of preaching to the people in Rome itself. We are not left to the merely negative evidence of his being the first Roman sermons now extant, for the historian Sozomen, whose narrative comes down to A.D. 439, the very year before Leo's accession, makes the following remarkable statement: 'Neither the Bishop nor any other person teaches there [Rome] in church;'³ a testimony confirmed by Cassiodorus,⁴ whose familiarity with Roman customs shuts out the plea of error which might be alleged in the case of a foreigner like Sozomen. The bearing of these two facts on the claims of the Popes as supreme teachers of Christendom is very direct, because they establish jointly that in no intelligible sense whatever could Rome have been resorted to or regarded during the first four centuries of Christianity as a place of theological instruction. She had to accept the theology provided for her by the divines of more learned and philosophical Churches, instead of originating any teaching

¹ Dupin, *Bibl. Eccl.* iii. 2.² See Routh, *Rel. Sac.* iii.³ *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 19.⁴ *Hist. Tripart. Eccl.* ix. 39.

herself; and the pulpit was as silent as the pen throughout that long period within her walls.

On no hypothesis whatever that Rome was recognized as the teaching centre of ancient Christendom could such a state of things have existed. Even if the functions of supreme teacher be limited to the sense in which the sovereign in Great Britain is the supreme legislator—that is, that the stamp of Papal assent gave validity and currency to all teaching, which, without it, might indeed be true, but would still be only private and unauthoritative—yet in that case theologians would have as surely gravitated to Rome, if only to obtain this necessary certificate more quickly, as politicians gravitate to London, Paris, or Berlin if they desire to share in or influence legislation in England, France, or Germany; and a great school of divinity must inevitably have grown up at the feet of the infallible Pope. But down to the very present no such manifestation has been visible at Rome from the earliest period. Nothing like the famous School of Alexandria was formed there in ancient times; nothing like the reputation of Paris or of Oxford fell in mediæval days to the lot of the University of Rome, which has never taken a respectable place amongst European seats of learning in all its centuries of existence, never trained one indigenous theologian of celebrity, nor sent out, as the two Universities just named habitually did, a supply of gifted scholars to supply the schools and pulpits of Latin Christendom. A broad fact of this kind, stretching over many centuries, affords far ampler disproof of the claim to universal teachership than any mere technical flaws in the plea itself, however serious and pregnant, can possibly do.

For more than twenty years previous to his elevation to the Papacy, Leo had been an active member of the Roman clergy, and was Archdeacon of Rome as early as 422. There can be no doubt at all of the manner in which the imperial character of Rome, transferred in idea to the ecclesiastical sphere, had seized on his imagination, nor how thoroughly he accepted the Petrine legend which the local patriotism and practised ingenuity of the urban clergy and lawyers, the far-reaching ambition of successive Pontiffs, had steadily built up out of the scantiest and most uncertain materials. When we remember the entire good faith with which Charles I. and his principal adherents clung to the theory of the hereditary Divine right of kings, albeit a sheer invention of the sixteenth century, and contradicted by the whole tenour of English history previous to the Tudor tyranny, we shall have less difficulty in

understanding how even Leo's masculine intellect could accept and steadily maintain the absolutist theory of Church government, especially as his practical turn of mind enabled him to see at once what a powerful instrument it must be in able hands for cementing a disintegrated and decaying society; and it can scarcely be matter of surprise that he never hesitated to avail himself of it. The one matter of regret is that the readiness to use both force and fraud in pushing the claims of the Roman See, which is the stigma of the later Papacy, is as manifest in Leo, despite his just title in some respects to the name of Saint, as it is in a Boniface VIII. or an Eugenius IV.

The first leading instance occurred early in his Pontificate. So far back as 416 Pope Zosimus, as mentioned above, had assigned the primacy of Narbonensian Gaul to the See of Arles. In 445 S. Hilary, then Archbishop of Arles, during a visitation of his province, deposed formally in synod Celidonus, Bishop of Besançon, as canonically disqualified from office, because having married a widow, and having also, previous to his ordination, taken part in a criminal trial ending in a capital sentence, and thus having, in a sense, blood on his hands.

Celidonus went to Rome, and appealed in person to the Pope, on the plea that his diocese lay within the jurisdiction of Vienne, not of Arles; and Leo quashed in his favour the decree of Zosimus and the sentence of Hilary, restoring him to his rank, receiving him to communion, and permitting him to perform episcopal functions in his presence; all before any formal rehearing of the case, whereby the Pope violated, as Dupin points out, Canon V. of Nicæa, Canon LV. of Elvira, Canon XVI. of Arles I., Canon VII. of Turin, Canon II. of Orange I., Canon VIII. of Arles II., and the decretal of Innocent I. to Victorinus.¹ S. Hilary, on receiving the news, set out in his turn for Rome on foot, not, as he said himself publicly, to have the cause reheard on appeal, but to protest against Leo's interference, and arrived in the middle of winter. He at once charged the Pope with having decided against the merits of the case and in violation of ecclesiastical law; and the result was that, by an act of arbitrary violence hitherto unknown in Church history, he was thrown into a Roman prison by order of the Pope, who found that an easier process than to justify his own proceedings. S. Hilary, however, managed to escape, and returned to Arles, only to find Celidonus speedily reinstated at Besançon by the Pope, who treated the Saint's escape from prison as an

¹ *De Antiq. Eccl. Discip.* Diss. ii. p. 209.

abandonment of the suit and a disclaimer of Papal jurisdiction, and proceeded further to excommunicate S. Hilary, and to deprive the See of Arles of its jurisdiction over Viennese and Narbonensian Gaul, an act which, as we have seen above, his predecessor Zosimus had declared to exceed the powers of the Roman Chair itself. And the only ground Leo alleges for this act, in his epistle to the Gallic bishops, is that S. Hilary 'did not await the great moderation in judgment of the Prince of the Apostles, which he always exhibits through his vicars.'¹

No act at all parallel to this outrage on canonical rights in the person of an orthodox bishop of a great see had previously occurred, which could serve as a precedent. And it should not be forgotten that as yet the only provisions which made any sort of interference, other than merely diplomatic, feasible for the Pope were the dubious canons of Sardica, which, however, were rejected by Africa and the East, and do not appear to have been put in use anywhere in the West. But they had been fully adopted into the code of Roman canon law; and accordingly, if Leo (who cites them as Nicene canons, despite the then recent African exposure, in a letter to Theodosius II. in 449, though not on the question of appeals, Leon. *Epist.* xliii.) had chosen to fall back on them, and had caused the case of Hilary and Celidonius to be reheard at Arles, in accordance with them, it might arguably be pleaded that he was dealing with the matter on grounds of strict legality.² The only other right he could have conceivably enjoyed in respect of the case would have been in virtue of his patriarchal office. But herein a very curious difference existed between the Eastern and the Western Churches. In the East the patriarchates were of very wide extent, geographically and jurisdictionally, while but a very few autocephalous Churches, such as that of Cyprus, were scattered here and there within their area. It was thus not easy for any Eastern prelate of the first rank to make encroachments on a large scale, because he could not do so without stirring up an equally powerful neighbour in defence of his imperilled privileges. But in the West, owing to the sparse population and the absence of large cities, only one patriarchate existed, as against the four Eastern ones, and it

¹ Baron. *Ann.* 445, xiv.

² Tillemont (*Mem.* xv. 74) hints that the reason why Leo did not fall back on the Sardican canons was because S. Hilary was not likely to know any more about their existence than the African bishops had done: another indirect argument for a forgery.

was restricted to the narrow area of the provinces of Central and Southern Italy (not even including Milan or Aquileia), together with the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica—that is to say, the ‘Suburbicarian Provinces.’¹ Consequently Gaul, Spain, Germany, and Britain all lay outside the Pope’s special jurisdiction, and might have seemed safe from his encroachments. But the very fact that he had no rival in office throughout the West, nor, indeed, any inferior of so much as approximately comparable rank save the Bishop of Milan, made it much easier for him to bring all the pressure of his position to bear on any of the Western diocesans, who, as comparatively isolated, and in no case holding more than exarchal rank, were much less able to fight their own battles, or to find any powerful ally, than the occupant of a menaced Oriental see. Nevertheless the Westerns could appeal to the then very recent canon of Ephesus, forbidding any prelate to usurp jurisdiction in a diocese or province which had not been from the very beginning subject to his see, and obliging him to restore it, in the event of any such encroachment having been made. This canon was of course perfectly familiar to Leo, nor can he be supposed ignorant of the narrow area of his own legal jurisdiction. And accordingly, as we have seen, he does not plead canon law as his justification at all, but has recourse to a theory of ‘superabounding’ jurisdiction inherent in himself as heir of S. Peter, and empowering him to override all Church law in any emergency, though suffering the ordinary routine to be guided in the usual fashion. It is impossible, however, to acquit him even on the ground of his belief in this theory, because he was making a new precedent on this occasion, and could not appeal to any previous exercise of similar authority on the part of either S. Peter himself or of any of his own predecessors in the Roman Chair. S. Hilary took his stand on the canons, and refused to yield to the pressure put upon him, as involving a betrayal of the rights he was bound to defend. And then Leo took the step which has branded his memory ever since, and is wholly incapable of palliation. He applied to the weak and dissolute Valentinian III. to bring the arm of the State to bear on a man whom he falsely represented not merely as a spiritual offender, but as a rebel against the civil power, and obtained the following Imperial rescript, addressed to Aëtius, then commander-in-chief in Gaul, whose terms, there can be no reasonable doubt, Leo dictated himself, and which simply swarms with falsehoods :—

¹ Dupin, *Antiq. Discip. Eccl.* i. ix.

'It is certain that the one and only safeguard of Us and Our Empire is in the favour of God Most High, towards meriting which Christian faith and our venerable religion mainly conduce. Whereas, therefore, the authority of a sacred Synod¹ hath confirmed the Primacy of the Apostolic See, the merit of S. Peter, who is the Prince of the Episcopal Choir (*coronæ*), and the dignity of the City of Rome, so that no presumption should attempt to do aught unpermitted by the authority of that See; then only will the peace of the Churches be preserved, if the whole world (*universitas*) acknowledge its ruler. And whereas this rule has been hitherto inviolably observed, Hilary of Arles (as We learn from the faithful narrative of the venerable Leo, Pope of Rome) hath with contumacious daring presumed to attempt certain unlawful acts, and consequently an abominable disturbance has invaded the Transalpine Churches, as a recent example proves. For Hilary, who is styled Bishop of Arles, without consulting the Pontiff of the Roman Church, but from his own rashness alone, has usurped and seized upon the ordinations of bishops which in no way belong to him; for he removes some illegally, and has ordained others irregularly, against the wishes and remonstrances of the citizens. And as these bishops were not readily received by those who had not elected them, he collected an armed band, and in hostile fashion either laid siege to or breached by storm the defences of the walls, and installed by process of war into his see the man whose duty it would be to preach peace.²

'When these offences against the Imperial Majesty, and against the reverence due to the Apostolic See, had been investigated by order of the holy Pope of the City, a certain sentence was passed on him [Hilary] by reason of those whom he had unduly ordained. And that sentence would have been valid throughout Gaul, even without the Imperial sanction.³ For what could fail to be lawful power over the Churches, if supported by the authority of so great a Pontiff? However, this motive has called Our attention also to the matter, lest it should be assumed possible for Hilary (whom nothing but the kindness of the amiable Pontiff suffers to bear still the name of bishop), or for any other person, to mix warfare up with Church questions, or to disobey the precepts of the Roman Pontiff. For by such outrages the Faith and the honour of Our Empire are violated. Nor do We urge this ground alone, which is a crime of the deepest dye, but, in order that not even the slightest disturbance may arise amongst the Churches, or religious discipline be in any respect relaxed, We decree by this perpetual edict that it shall not be lawful for the bishops of Gaul, or of the other provinces, contrary to ancient custom, to do aught without the authority of the venerable Pope of the Eternal City; and whatsoever the authority of the Apostolic See has enacted, or may hereafter enact, shall be the law for all. So

¹ There is a careful absence of any specification. In fact, no such synod had ever existed so far, and Leo knew it.

² A second falsehood. No such acts were committed.

³ A third falsehood, for the Bishops of Gaul declared the Pope's sentence canonically void.

that if any bishop, summoned to trial before the Pope of Rome, shall neglect to attend, he shall be compelled to appearance by the governor of that province, in all respects regard being had to what privileges Our deified parents conferred on the Roman Church.¹ Wherefore your Illustrious and Eminent Magnificence is to cause what is enacted above to be observed in virtue of this present edict and law, and a fine of ten pounds [of gold] is to be at once levied on any judge who suffers Our commands to be disobeyed.²

This secular mandate of course secured the reinstatement of Celidonius; but S. Hilary did not yield a whit as to the rights of the matter, and though he had sought reconciliation with Leo by the means of legates whom he sent, yet he directed his envoys not to agree to any conditions involving breach of the canons, and of course they could obtain no others. A very interesting letter to S. Hilary from Auxiliarius, Prefect of Italy, whose mediation he had asked, is still extant in the Life of the Saint by his pupil, S. Honoratus, Bishop of Marseilles, a brief extract from which is worth citing, as highly instructive:—

‘I have been conversing with the holy Pope Leo. . . . I never remember any conduct of your Blessedness which was stained with the disease of arrogance; but men take it impatiently if we speak as we feel, and Roman ears are more easily influenced by soft speeches; so if your Holiness can now and then stoop to that, you gain much and can lose nothing. Do me this favour, and dispel these slight clouds into fair weather by a trifling change of demeanour.’

S. Hilary, however, was too high-minded to follow such advice, and died without making any submission whatever or acknowledging the validity of the Pope's conduct. It would seem, therefore, that he also died excommunicated: but such was the force of his personal holiness that he is nevertheless enrolled high amongst the Roman saints; nay, Leo himself speaks of him as ‘Hilary of holy memory’ in a letter to the clergy of Arles on the election of his successor Ravennius in 449.³

It is impossible to lay too much stress on this nefarious transaction, which is the true beginning of the Papal usurpation over the Church, and fitly appears as the result of no Divine grant, but of the reckless edict of a dissolute secular

¹ No evidence exists as to what is here intended. There is nothing of the kind amongst the acts of Constantius III. and Galla Placidia, the actual parents of Valentinian III., and the reference may just possibly be to the disputed rescript of Gratian, previously referred to (*Church Quarterly Review*, January 1880, p. 513).

² Baron. *Ann.* 445, ix. x.

³ S. Leon. Ep. xxxvi.

tyrant, who closed his infamous career with the murder, by his own hand and sword, of the illustrious general Aëtius (the very person to whom the above rescript was addressed) and with the violation of a noble Roman matron, decoyed to his palace by a fraud, whose husband avenged his wrongs by shedding the ravisher's blood.¹ This edict of Valentinian III., not the speech of Christ to Peter uttered at Cæsarea Philippi, is the charter of the modern Papacy; and it is in virtue of the powers conferred thereby that the Popes at once began to wield the power which they exercised for several centuries over France, Spain, Germany, and even Britain: though, as regards the last-named country, there was not even the show of civil right which might be and was pleaded in the remaining Western provinces, because Britain and Armorica, or Lesser Britain, had ceased to form part of the Empire in the year 409, when, finding that they received no military aid against their enemies, they threw off a yoke which could no longer justify itself by giving protection to its subjects. And the Emperor Honorius, instead of challenging their decision by the arbitrament of the sword or any other process, issued letters to the new States, in which he recognized their independence and abandoned all claims to sovereignty over them. Armorica, unable to defend itself for any length of time, speedily returned to its former allegiance, but Britain never again constituted a part of the Roman dominions, and consequently the edict of Valentinian was thirty-six years too late for validity within its limits.² It may, therefore, be classed with any English Act of Parliament of 1819 which might conceivably be urged as having authority in the United States, in despite of the Treaty of Versailles, whereby Great Britain acknowledged the independence of the revolted colonies on September 3, 1783.

Here we must pause, for the present, in our review of the share which S. Leo had in establishing the Papal Monarchy in Western Christendom.

¹ Gibbon, c. xxxv. Another account ascribes his death to some soldiers of Aëtius.

² *Ibid.* c. xxxi.

ART. VIII.—RECENT FORTUNES OF THE
CHURCH IN OXFORD.

1. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on University Tests, together with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix.* (September 1870.)
2. *First Report from the Select Committee, &c. Session 1871.*
3. *Clerical Fellowships and Headships in the Universities; a speech delivered in the House of Commons, Friday, July 9, 1880.* By C. S. ROUNDELL, M.P. (London, 1880.)
4. *The Church and the Universities; a Letter, &c.* By JOHN WORDSWORTH, M.A., Tutor and late Fellow of Brasenose College. (Oxford, 1880.)
5. *The Disestablishment of Religion in Oxford; the Betrayal of a Sacred Trust; Words of Warning to the University; a Sermon.* By J. W. BURGON, B.D., Dean of Chichester. (Oxford, 1880.)
6. *Statutes proposed to be made by the University of Oxford Commissioners for All Souls' College, Balliol College, Christ Church, Corpus Christi College, Exeter College, Jesus College, Lincoln College, Magdalen College, Oriel College, Queen's College, Trinity College, Oxford, November 1880.* Printed by E. Pickard Hall, M.A., and J. H. Stacy, printers to the University.
7. *A Bygone Oxford.* By F. GOLDIE, S.J. (London, 1881.)

'THE Church of England,' said Edmund Burke, 'has the security of the two Universities, not shook in any single battlement, in any single pinnacle.'¹ In the year 1773, a Bill for the Relief of Protestant Dissenters had been brought into the House of Commons; and it was opposed, strangely as we should now think, by petitions from several congregations of 'Methodists,' and, more strangely still, on the ground that the Bill threatened the security of the Established Church. Burke advocated the Bill; and his speech, or what remains of it, is remarkable for opinions, which would now pass on both sides of the House as among the common places of politics, but which a hundred years ago had almost the freshness of original and daring speculation. When Burke says that "toleration is a part of religion,"² he expresses an obvious

¹ *Works*, ed. 1826, vol. x. p. 23.

² *Ibid.* p. 35.

truth, if not quite in his happiest manner; and when he maintains that 'in establishing the Christian religion wherever you find it, curiosity or research is its best security,' we find it difficult to understand how such a position could have been questioned in the days of George III. But in the eyes of Burke and his contemporaries such a statement, however true, was also a concession to hostile opinion; and, regarded as a concession, it was qualified by the consideration that Christianity, or rather the Church of England, had at its disposal resources which enabled it to take very good care of the sacred interests that were in its keeping. Burke deprecates repressive enactments against dissenters, partly, at any rate, because he relies on the learning as well as on the character of Churchmen; and in this connexion it is that he points with natural and justifiable confidence to the position of the Church in 'the two Universities.'

If, in this paper, we confine ourselves strictly to the University of Oxford, our readers will not suppose us to accept the paradox that 'Oxford is the only really important position in the line of battle.' We write of what we know; and we happen to know more about Oxford than about her younger but brilliant sister. For eighty-one years after Burke's speech his words would still have applied to Oxford. In all the centuries of her history Oxford has been nothing if not the handmaid and home of the Church. In an appendix to his Sermon,¹ to which we would refer our readers for fuller information, Dean Burgon has shown with forcible and pathetic conciseness that the colleges of Oxford were pre-eminently religious foundations. This character attaches equally to University College—so ancient that its exact origin is unknown—and to Worcester, which was founded in 1714. The paramount importance of religion is a subject on which each generation of founders has a common feeling. Devorguilla Balliol, and Bishop Walter de Merton; Walter Stapleton, and Robert de Eglesfield and William of Wykeham; Archbishop Chicheley, and Bishops Fleming and Rotheram, and Waynflete, and Smyth, and Fox, are here at one. In their eyes the Church of God did not exist for the sake of the University; but the University was happy if she could be a handmaid of the Church of God. At its oldest college the master was to be a priest; the fellows devoted to the study of theology. The master and fellows of Balliol were cautioned in their statutes to take heed, lest, while logic and philosophy, the handmaids of theology, were hard at work, theology herself should

¹ *Disestablishment of Religion in Oxford*, appendix D., pp. 45-52.

slumber. Even at Merton, with its anti-monastic purpose, the liberal arts and philosophy were generally designed to lead on to the study of theology. Over Oriel, the Dean of Chichester lingers with a tenderness which his readers will be at no loss to understand; Oriel was to be just as much an ecclesiastical foundation as any of our present cathedrals; all its eighteen fellows were to be ultimately theologians; each successive addition to the resources of the college kept this sacred purpose in view; and, on the three Commemoration Days, it was solemnly brought before the Provost and Fellows. We cannot forget, on the morrow of its final secularization, that Oriel was the source of the greatest religious movement in our modern history; and, if we except his recent eccentric alliance with the fierce and irrational section of the Puritan party, Dean Burgon's own honourable and useful career will be remembered hereafter as not the least of the titles of that great college, in its Christian days, to the gratitude of the Church. But we must not linger over a part of our subject, where to linger is only to repeat what has been already said. Queen's College and Lincoln were to be colleges of priests. The name of Corpus Christi speaks for itself; its fellows were all to take holy orders. Even the fragment of Wolsey's splendid foundation which escaped the rapacity of Henry VIII., and which he refounded as Christ Church, bears the same religious imprint as its predecessors; and this holds good moreover, not merely of the two colleges, Trinity and S. John's, which were born during the reign of Mary, but also, and in no less a degree, of the four colleges which only date after the Reformation. Different as were the influences under which their founders lived, in one thing the later foundations agree; Jesus College under Queen Elizabeth, Wadham under James I., Pembroke under Charles I., and Worcester in 1714, were all to be religious foundations, and devoted to the study of theology.

During the Middle Ages the religious character of Oxford had been further secured by the great monastic houses, none of which were without some relations to the University, while some were intimately related to it. The Augustinians were at S. Frideswide's, and in their far more splendid abbey at Osney. Benedictine learning made a home for itself in Gloucester College, on the site of the present Worcester. The Cistercians were at Rewley, and later in the buildings which are now S. John's; the Austin Friars in Holywell; the Trinitarians on the Cherwell; the Crutched Friars in Pembroke Street and S. Peter's-in-the-East; the Carmelites in Beaumont Palace.

In a part of Oxford, which an undergraduate now rarely if ever visits, were the two monasteries which most powerfully affected the mediæval life of the University. Speedwell Street now runs through what used to be the great house and church of the Dominicans; Robert Bacon, Richard Fisacre, Robert Kilwarby, afterwards Primate, Cardinal Macclesfield, are among its famous names. Nearer to Paradise Square were the Franciscans, the most academical of the monastic bodies in Oxford. Four of its great worthies will alone and for ever preserve this house from the oblivion which its utter disappearance might else invite; they are Roger Baron, Duns Scotus, Nicolas de Lyra, and William Occam. At the Dissolution, monastic Oxford vanished for good or evil: although in Christ Church, Wadham, Worcester, and S. John's Colleges some material relics of it may yet be traced.

But Oxford was religious, passionately religious in its way, even during the dark days of Puritan ascendancy, when Owen was Dean of Christ Church. And the position which had been again secured to the Church by the Laudian statutes after the Restoration remained unimpaired throughout Burke's lifetime, and until 1854. In that year began a series of changes, which have now been in progress for more than a quarter of a century. Whatever else these changes may have done, they have made the Oxford of to-day much more unlike that of our fathers and grandfathers than was the Oxford which they knew and loved unlike that of the Middle Ages. More than this: these changes have profoundly affected the relations of the University with the Church and religion; they have almost, if not altogether, dissolved a union which had lasted already for a thousand years.

In Oxford, as it was before 1854, the Church was still everything and everywhere; every college, and the University itself, equally belonged to it. Not merely every head and every professor, but every undergraduate, was of necessity a Churchman. The whole resource of the place, its property and its intellect, was, so far as statute law could make it to be so, at the disposal of the Church; and Oxford was national, only in what was then deemed to be a sufficient sense, namely, that its action and fortunes were closely and exclusively identified with the Church of the English people. Nowhere else in England might the Church of the Middle Ages have appeared to live on in a form so vivid and engaging, as among these societies of unmarried men, mostly devoted to the sacred ministry, although, of course, in a reformed Church, and amid buildings which reflected and perpetuated the spirit of their

founders. Foreigners, like Lacordaire, have left on record the charm which was inspired by a visit to Oxford; and Englishmen proudly remembered that nowhere else in Europe had there been preserved intact so interesting a relic of the higher life of the days of the Plantagenets, while they also knew how intimately their great University was associated with the political and religious activity of modern times.

That the Church of England during even long periods failed to make due use of the splendid opportunities which her relation to the University placed at her disposal, must be sorrowfully admitted. It was the old story. She occupied a position which seemed to be insured against attack from without; and the men who represented her in Oxford yielded to the dangers with which fancied security is often accompanied; they trusted too much to the political outworks of their position. Their shortcomings have indeed been exaggerated by writers who have been tempted to draw fancifully dark pictures of Oxford in the last century, in order to justify the revolutionary changes of our own days. But that political feeling often ran high, and took up thought and time which would better have been given to other objects; that common-room society was not always very refined; that intellectual and literary activity would often follow the fashion of a coarse and irreligious age, instead of attempting to raise it to a higher level: this certainly must be admitted. Nay more, that there was much drunkenness in Oxford, as in the classes from which resident Oxonians were recruited throughout the last century, rests, we fear, upon evidence too cogent to be disputed. And the decline of literary interests may be tested by a visit to the library of any one of the smaller colleges. We remark that up to the end of the seventeenth century there is a constant supply of the best European literature of the day; the fellows of the Restoration period, as well as the fellows who had lived under Abbott and Laud, actively occupied themselves as students of all the attainable knowledge of their age. From the beginning of the eighteenth century down to the rise of the Tractarian movement it is otherwise. A few biographies, county histories, sermons, are the staple of all that was added to the library during that period. About 1837 or 1838 there is a sudden influx of new books—of theology and of such history as had theological bearings; and in more recent years, as might be expected, theology has been superseded by philosophy, or by general literature.

This no doubt must be admitted; but the indictment

against the Oxford which lasted from Aldrich to Gaisford goes far beyond this. It takes no account of the many unobtrusive students who lived on their fellowships, and who still made valuable contributions to literature and to theology, of which the world has ceased to think. It measures the whole life of the place by the ostentatious demerits of a moiety of its inhabitants; it attributes to local influences and to academical shortcomings what really belonged to the spirit of the time. The day for doing justice—neither more nor less than justice—to the Oxford of our grandfathers has not yet come. The great nobles of the Court of Elizabeth, whose sires had been enriched by the spoils of the monasteries, were not in a position to recognize the real character of the corporations, whose members had been robbed—in some cases murdered—by Henry, in order to enrich his courtiers or to enable him to gratify his sinful pleasures. The last decade of the eighteenth century was not a good time for an impartial discussion in France of the merits and failings of the old régime. 'Liberal' and secular Oxford is still too near to the religious and ecclesiastical Oxford which she has dethroned and succeeded, to be capable of any moderately impartial estimate of a system which had to be well abused before there was any chance of getting rid of it, and which cannot prudently be condoned while its funeral rites are still going on.

From our own point of view, indeed, as Catholic-minded Churchmen, we have our complaints to make of Oxford, such as the Church movement of 1833 found it; but they are complaints not of the system, but of its administrators. The system which lasted unimpaired during the first half of the present century was exactly adapted to welcome and promote a great revival of serious religion, like that which was inaugurated by the Tractarians, while such a revival in its turn was calculated to quicken in the best sense the intellectual as well as the moral life of the University. Societies of comparatively young men, unmarried, living under statutes which, however neglected in practice, could never be read without suggesting a high and consecrated life; living in buildings which everywhere recalled the beauty and resource of the Church; and already obeying, at least, the rudimentary laws of community life, by their presence in Chapel and in Hall;—such societies were a field of action ready to the hand of a religious genius who might be led to breathe on them the kind of inspiration which was needed to make them worthy of themselves. And everybody knows whence and when this inspiration came, and what it achieved. There

was not a college in Oxford in which some, juniors or seniors, did not own the invigorating and elevating influence that came from Oriel. Men still living recall the change which passed over the face of Oxford society; how life was quickened with the enthusiasm of a new hope; how study, friendships, tastes were all influenced by one supreme consideration; how thought and literature suddenly received, at any rate in one direction, a most powerful impetus: and, above all, how remarkable an elevation of character, wherever the influence of the movement extended, was noticeable: simplicity, disinterestedness, the love of self-sacrifice, indifference to human praise, taking the place of characteristics which had often, with too much truth, been previously associated with Oxford habits.

The Tractarian movement was the day of grace for the Church in Oxford. It was Jerusalem's time of visitation, which—as has happened so often in history—she ignored with an even tragical indifference. A spirit was abroad, ready to make all things new; justifying old institutions by invigorating them with the enthusiasms of youth; reanimating the moral convictions which had made founders and benefactors lavish their wealth upon the Church of Christ; breathing into work as well as into prayer, into literature as well as into philanthropy, into art—whether music, or architecture, or poetry—as well as into scientific theology, a reality and vigour that had long been wanting. When Mr. Newman had left Oxford, and was living at Littlemore, a friend arrived one day and announced, 'A certain book had been publicly burned; what is it?' Newman answered at once, *The Christian Year*. He was right: that little volume was, in the eyes of the opponents of the movement, the *fons et origo mali*.¹ It did more to popularize the two theological characteristics of the Tractarian school, the sacramental principle—understanding that term in a large sense—and the mystical interpretation of Scripture, than any other work. But a broader and juster conception of the width and compass of the movement is perhaps to be gained from a smaller volume of poems, to which Mr. Keble indeed largely contributed, while its deepest thoughts are generally those of Cardinal Newman himself, who also was the most considerable contributor to its pages. While treating of scriptural and ecclesiastical scenes and characters, the *Lyra Apostolica* exhibits the ideas and feelings of the early Tractarians in the days of their fresh and hopeful activity; and we trace

¹ Dr. Pusey has related this, we believe, more than once.

everywhere in its pages the presence of that wonderful mind, always logical and almost always pathetic, whose later paradoxes and aberrations, as we must deem them, have forfeited the obedience of reason, in cases where men cannot free themselves from a spell that still so strongly holds captive the imagination and the heart.

If the Heads of Houses of that day, or rather those among them who swayed the action of the rest, had been men of larger views than they were, they would assuredly have welcomed the Tractarian movement as a timely and effectively against dangers threatening all that they themselves held to be precious and sacred. To ordinary minds indeed forty years ago all seemed as secure and immovable in the world of thought as had been the case ever since Butler and Paley had silenced the Deists. But there were among the Tractarian leaders men who knew what had been said in Germany, and who had their eye upon what might too easily become an aggressive or even a dominant influence in England. Dr. Pusey, as a young man, had attended the lectures of Eichhorn at Göttingen, and of Schleiermacher at Berlin. Mr. Newman foresaw that the question that would have to be presently fought out was not the authority of the Church, but the worth of the Bible. As each promising boy arrived from Rugby—then under the control of Dr. Arnold—his tendencies were anxiously noted by the resident Tractarians; and, if we are not misinformed, some predictions as to future careers were hazarded, which have been singularly confirmed by the event. But the Heads of Houses, as a rule, cared for none of these things; they were only intent on repressing an active and unpopular form of earnest Churchmanship. The Dean of Christ Church of the day, Dr. Gaisford, ranked with the very first scholars in Europe; but seldom has a great institution been committed to the care of a man less fitted by character to do justice to its opportunities; and his unfortunate but natural influence on the Hebdomadal Board contributed to reinforce with the weight of high position and indisputable learning the short-sighted prejudices of puritanical or indifferent colleagues. The Heads of Houses, under the guidance of two Low Church Vice-Chancellors, left no stone unturned to make the Tractarian position untenable; when, by a wise and conciliatory policy, they might have averted, in all probability, a serious catastrophe, and have secured to the English Church a band of learned and saintly men, whose services the cause of positive Christian theology could ill afford to lose. One of the Vice-Chancellors in question lived to express his regret

for the line which the University authorities had taken in dealing with the Tractarians.

There is no need to dwell further on an unwelcome subject; everybody knows what happened. Mr. Newman's sensitive nature shrank from a prolonged conflict with coarse prejudices which did not even attempt to do him justice. He endeavoured to invest the cause of Roman Catholicism with an evidential force which, as against the English Church, belonged to it, if at all, only in such sense as it belonged to Rationalism; while he was really obeying what looked to him like 'tokens' supplied by his own personal experience. But after S. Mary's came Littlemore; and after Littlemore Oscott. The opposition to Tractarianism had triumphed; it had made a solitude, and called it peace.

No, not quite a 'solitude.' We are able to speak of the years which immediately followed on the collapse of 1845 from personal recollections. The sun of Newman's genius had set upon Oxford; but the after-glow remained. There were few common rooms in which the movement was unrepresented; in some its influence was predominant. As yet the moral fascination of the Parochial Sermons at S. Mary's had not passed away. As yet it had not become an intellectual fashion to assume the truth of the *latest* premises of the author of the Essay on Development, and then to ask what was the rational alternative to be taken by a man who was not prepared to go to Rome. Dr. Pusey was still lecturing and giving advice at Christ Church, as he has advised and lectured for more than thirty years since. Charles Marriott, an intellectual man of saintly character too nearly forgotten by a younger generation, was at Oriel. Mr. James Mozley, who lived to become Regius Professor of Divinity, had not yet inferred from S. Augustine's predestinarianism an estimate of baptism to which S. Augustine would never have subscribed, and he was writing for the *Christian Remembrancer* at Magdalen. At Trinity Mr. Arthur Haddon, a true theologian and a profound historical scholar, was slowly maturing those powers of which the Church was deprived by his comparatively early death. In these years there was a gathering every Sunday evening at the Radcliffe Observatory, under the auspices of a man, whose large heart and strong and penetrating intellect will long live in the memory of his friends—Mr. Manuel Johnson. There might be met the remaining members of the Oriel School, the present Dean of S. Paul's, Mr. Chretien, Mr. Buckle, Mr. Henry J. Coleridge—since lost, alas! to the English Church—together with friends from

almost every college in Oxford, and not seldom in the company of representatives of other intellectual interests, such as Professor Max Müller, then a young man just arrived from Germany. The Observer's house was a very palace of art; his illuminations and especially his engravings were famous in England, and there was never any lack of interesting conversation on topics of general literature, or on the nascent political enthusiasms of which Mr. Gladstone was then the centre. But also there was always a deep, pathetic under-current of religious feeling, making itself heard from time to time in an incidental remark, or in a sudden silence, or at least in a studied reserve of expression, which witnessed to the power which the movement still exercised over some of the most accomplished members of the University.

Everything, or almost everything, might have been recovered, but for two blows, which fell upon the work of the Tractarians in quick succession. The first was the Gorham Decision, which practically lost Archdeacon Manning, Mr. James Hope, Mr. Maskell, Mr. Allies, and, after an interval of four years, Archdeacon Wilberforce, to the English Church. True, they had ceased to reside in Oxford, and nothing occurred among the residents to recall the distress and panic of the autumn of 1845. But these later secessions had nevertheless an effect within the University, especially upon younger men. Such occurrences seemed to be a more deliberate confirmation of the course taken five years before by Newman; they seemed to be a practical commentary upon the opinion, sedulously inculcated by Roman Catholics and Puritans alike, that 'if you would remain in the Church of England you must give up Catholic antiquity'; and if they did not produce unsettlement of mind, or even keen anguish of conscience, they often—perhaps in the great majority of cases—led men to think that the questions between Rome and England could not be settled satisfactorily at all, and that, in fact, no such questions were of great importance. The party which has ultimately gained most by the secessions to Rome is that of the extreme Latitudinarians, at least among Oxford residents.

The other blow to which reference has been made was the University Commission of 1854; and here a few words are necessary to explain why we thus speak of it, and in such a connexion.

Of the statesmen, who had viewed the Oxford movement with more or less hostility, Lord John Russell was probably the most hostile. His own education had owed nothing to either University; and he united to a somewhat petty dislike

of an intellectual world in which he had had no share the old conventional half contempt, half fear, of the Church, which was an ingredient of the Whig temper. Lord John Russell was said to have resolved upon a reform of Oxford, which should make another Church movement impossible. To say that he succeeded in 1854 would be inaccurate; but he certainly set in motion a series of changes which have since issued in what he might well have deemed a complete success.

For with the year 1854 began what we now see to have been nothing less than an Academical Revolution, the final acts of which are being carried out as we write. In this revolution three epochs are observable, each of which issues in or results from an interference of the legislature; and the last of which has followed in quick, but not unnaturally quick, succession upon the second. These are the Commission of 1854, the University Tests Bill of 1871, and the Commission of 1877.

The action of the Commission of 1854 was marked by two especial characteristics. It made competition the avenue to almost all fellowships and scholarships. And it admitted persons of any or no religious belief to the benefits of University education.

That some change in the direction of the first of these measures was needed we do not for a moment deny. The older system sometimes led to much favouritism, and the enterprising intellect of the University was concentrated with undue intensity in one or two favoured colleges, such as Oriel. A healthy stimulus to exertion was undoubtedly afforded by the change; and, if this had been all, it would have resulted in much, although not in unqualified, improvement. Practically, we fear, it has run into exaggerations which those who at the time most earnestly insisted on its merits would be forward to deplore. We have lived to see colleges bidding against each other for the best-crammed boys in our public schools, by adding year by year a little more to the value of their scholarships; while in boyish scholars the main idea of a scholarship is its marketable value, and the opportunities it affords for a premature formation of extravagant habits. We have lived to see elections to fellowships determined, almost inevitably, by the report of a board of examining fellows; while such important questions as capacity for teaching, and other questions of far greater moment, are practically disregarded. Indeed in colleges, where the modern Academical 'Liberalism' is most decidedly in the ascendant, it has of late been found necessary occasionally to set aside the competitive

principle in favour of that of co-optation ; and fellows are elected, without any previous examination, because they are masters of some especial subject, or are thought likely to place some particular form of capacity at the service of the college. The wisdom of our non-competing forefathers has not had long to wait for at any rate a partial vindication.

Far more important, from our present point of view, was the admission of young men, not members of the Church, to the privileges of University education. That such a step was inevitable, sooner or later, was foreseen by some of its opponents ; and it was advocated on the double ground of generosity and justice. In those days the Church was still in possession, and the argument from 'justice,' which had so great a work to do in later years, was pressed only with studied moderation. The main appeal was to the generosity of Churchmen. Dissenters had but to come to Oxford, to be in contact with its intellectual and social attractions, and they would feel the touch of a fascination which was too subtle to be satisfactorily analysed and too powerful to be ignored. They would lose their hearts to the Ancient Church, as she welcomed them to this seat of learning, her chosen home for a thousand years. So it was to be, as we were told ; and to suppose that these new guests would ever combine to deprive their venerable host of what had been hers for ages was to entertain a suspicion so unworthy and libellous, that it must be at once dismissed.

It is said that the logic of facts was against the finality of this arrangement ; that when young men of nonconformist or infidel parentage and education had entered the gates of Oxford, and had won the highest honours she had to bestow, they could not long be refused a share in her fellowships and professorships. But this consequence was by no means allowed by some of those who had a great deal to do with the reforms of 1854. It may suffice to name the Rev. Dr. Jeune, at that time Master of Pembroke College, and afterwards Bishop of Peterborough ; one of the strongest and clearest intellects—although combined with a certain narrowness of sympathy—that Oxford has known for half a century. Dr. Jeune was twitted in his later Oxford days with having become Conservative, after working for some years as an ardent Reformer. 'I was a Reformer,' he replied, 'until I got the improvements I thought necessary ; when these were secured, I thought that no good would be done by further change, and I naturally became Conservative.' And then he went on to explain why, in his view, it

was right to admit non-Churchmen to University education, but wrong to admit them to those positions of rulers and teachers in the University which could not be surrendered without prejudicing the dearest interests of the Church.

Perhaps, if the Church had only had to reckon with external foes, the settlement of 1854 might have long outlived the generation which achieved it. But within Oxford itself, and among nominal Churchmen, a school had rapidly grown, which more than anticipated the demands of Dissenting Members of Parliament, and this with objects which certainly were very far from being theirs.

The serious, although temporary, defeat of Tractarianism could not but have grave consequences ; and of these consequences the most important, as has already been hinted, were seen not in the defections to Rome, but in the disintegration of convictions within the English Church. In this respect, Oxford as the source and centre of the movement, suffered especially. Men who, after being brought up in Puritanism or in indifferent Churchmanship, had listened with intelligence and sympathy to the Oxford teachers, could not be again what they once had been ; and if, on being deserted by some of the greatest of their new guides, they had not strength to hold to the principles which they had learnt, a break up of faith was almost, in some cases, inevitable. We can only think of one case of a really cultivated man, who fell back from Tractarianism to the Puritanism of his early life. Generally speaking, a larger knowledge of history, a wider idea of the philosophy of a world-wide religion had made Puritanism intellectually impossible ; and, in the uncertainty of the time, men lost their footing, and drifted into the abyss. There are, or were, minds in which the greatest moral impulse that has been given to educated men in England during this century came only to be remembered as an intellectual excitement, perhaps only as a wanton use of intellectual weapons to disturb convictions which memory cherishes while reason condemns them. Such minds brought to the as yet numerically weak party of theological Liberals a valuable accession of intelligence and strength ; and when this party was commanded by men with the literary resource and social gifts of the present Dean of Westminster, at that time Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and with the intellectual charm and strong will of the present Master of Balliol, it quickly became the most powerful influence within the University. In Professor Goldwin Smith it found an advocate who combined with the

knowledge of an accomplished historian some, if not all, of the instincts of a practical statesman, and the graces of a writer of the first order of excellence. Thus it was that, by degrees, the philosophical Liberals residing in Oxford learned to make common cause with the nonconformist and secularizing opponents of the Church in Parliament and elsewhere. Thus began the agitation, which, after years of patient labour and of growing audacity, placed on the Statute Book the University Tests Acts of 1871.

The arguments by which the advocates of this measure made their way were of a twofold character. The abolition of tests was represented sometimes as a measure of charitable relief, sometimes as a duty prescribed by justice. Its ablest advocates were most keenly interested in the first aspect of the proposal. It was natural that an educated man, with a sensitive conscience, who had subscribed the formularies of the English Church, and who held his position in virtue of this subscription, should wish to be rid of such an obligation upon discovering that he had, through whatever causes, lost, in part or altogether, his earlier faith. But the arguments which were really intended to promote a relief of persons thus situated were generally advanced with a skill which baffled the natural reply. Stress was laid on the *number* of propositions contained in the XXXIX. Articles; cases were put forward in which there was no difficulty about the general teaching of the Church, but only a scruple on a single or trifling point; and the defenders of subscription were asked why a man who sincerely accepted 38 of the articles should be made an enemy of the Church by being forced either to abandon his position or to subscribe the 39th. No question was raised as to clerical subscription; it was held to be meet and right that religious teachers should be publicly bound to teach the truths contained in the Church's formularies. But laymen—surely the case was different with them? In dealing with laymen, why could not an ancient and powerful Church show herself for once generous and trustful? Would not their disinterested and unconstrained loyalty more than compensate for the poor advantages of a silence that had been too long enforced by an unwelcome subscription? Would she not be better off, if, instead of being surrounded by irritated subjects, she could command the willing love and homage of enthusiastic sons?

A great deal had to be softened to allay the fears of anxious Churchmen, whose instincts told them, the while, that they were threatened with a change of revolutionary import.

But a different language was used with a view of moving public opinion at large. The abolition of tests was demanded as a concession to justice; and the 'logic of justice,' as understood by academical Liberalism, has been a main factor in promoting the changes which we have since witnessed, and which are still in progress. This 'justice' began with making an assumption, for which there was little documentary evidence, namely, that institutions, whose statutes at every page proclaimed them to be the property of the Church, whether before or since the Reformation, were really the property not of the Church but of the nation. Under cover of this assumption, it was contended, nonconformists, whether Christian or non-Christian, who had given proofs of ability and knowledge, were entitled to become fellows and tutors; and fellows and tutors who had abandoned the faith of the Church were entitled to retain their positions as being the servants not of the Church but of the nation. This 'logic' went on to parody the Divine principle, 'Whosoever hath to him shall be given'; each concession was made a premise for demanding another; and although for the moment clerical headships and fellowships were spared, it was felt that prudence alone had dictated a hesitation which the new logical 'justice' must secretly condemn.

The grievances of the Dissenters were put in the forefront of the argument; and the Dissenters were naturally anxious to secure, if they could, a share in the endowments and position of the educating body in the University. But, if the truth is to be spoken, the Dissenters from the first and throughout were made a 'catspaw' by the Philosophical Radicals both in London and Oxford. We do not use the expression disrespectfully; but no other expression is adequately historical. Everybody who knew Oxford knew that the forms of non-Christian or non-Theistic thought, which really desired to make for themselves in permanence a legal and moral home in Oxford, were almost as remote from the more believing varieties of Protestant Dissent as from the convictions of large sections of the Church herself. Everybody who knew Oxford knew that, with the possible exception of Socinianism, Dissent is never likely to be much at home in its intellectual atmosphere; unless indeed Oxford should abandon her old relations with mental science and historic method in some new and overpowering enthusiasm for physics and mathematics. In a critical and literary atmosphere, belief in a canon of inspired Scripture is as difficult as belief in the claims of an historic Church—neither more nor less—upon the whole; while, if the

presumptions which warrant faith are recognized at all, it is easier to believe—to use a phrase of Mr. Keble's—in a Revelation with two factors than in a Revelation with only one. Thus it would seem probable that the contest for religious influence, properly so called, in the Oxford of the future will lie between the Anglican and Roman Churches, with their differing representations of the principle of Church authority; and that such Trinitarian Protestant Dissent as may appear on the scene will too probably sink away, under the influence of the intellectual solvents that will be applied to it, into Socinianism, philosophical Theism, and the darker forms of thought beyond. It is certain that the resident Liberalism of Oxford had no interest in Protestant Dissent outside, except as affording it a topic that might be usefully employed against the Church, and an alliance in Parliament that might promote an object, desired for reasons very different from any which would be welcome to any kind of 'evangelical' religion.

That the University Tests Bill owed its final triumph in part to the bearers of honoured names in the first ranks of political life—names which, in consideration of past services, would always have been dear to Churchmen—must be sorrowfully admitted. The Bill, in its earlier forms, was an especial protégé of the present Lord Coleridge, and it became law under the first ministry of Mr. Gladstone. But statesmen have a right to plead that the final result was secured with the aid of Episcopal assistance; and that if the Fathers of the Church thought such a measure advisable, earnest laymen could not be very far wrong in yielding to a demand which had become of late politically importunate. It is painfully instructive to read the Debate in the House of Lords on May 8, 1871. Lord Salisbury had proposed that

'No person shall be appointed to the office of tutor, assistant tutor, dean, censor, or lecturer in divinity, in any college now subsisting in the said Universities, until he shall have made and subscribed the following declaration in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor, or, in the University of Durham, of the Warden; that is to say, I. A. B. do solemnly declare that while holding the office of [] I will not teach anything contrary to the teaching or Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.'

This was, in truth, in view of what had been hitherto required, a very modest proposal. It implied that all positions in the University to which honour and emolument, without teaching duties, were attached, had been already surrendered to the Church's opponents. It left the Fellows of Merton, for instance, at liberty to elect as their warden a Dissenter or

an unbeliever, if they chose to do so. It did not enforce loyalty to the distinctive faith of the Church; it only provided a negative safeguard for Holy Scripture. It might have been welcomed by any believing Dissenting minister as warmly as by Dr. Pusey; but it did undoubtedly imply that religion was still to be, in some sense, respected in all the professorial chairs and lecture rooms of Oxford.

Of the prelates who took part in the debate, the Bishops of Lincoln, Salisbury, and Gloucester and Bristol supported the motion. Bishop Moberly spoke with the authority of an old Oxford tutor on the quasi-parental character of a tutor's relation to his pupils, and on the influence attaching to it. Bishop Ellicott discussed some larger aspects of the question with much insight and courage. But, side by side with the Duke of Somerset and Lord Westbury were found prelates from whom the Church might have hoped for support in a matter touching the dearest interests of her children, but who, at this critical moment, threw their weight into the scale of her foes. The Archbishop of York enlarged upon the general uselessness of tests. The Bishop of Oxford pointed to Keble College, as showing that it was 'possible to have free religious institutions without the infliction of a test.' As if, in its council, Keble College had not a guarantee for its religious character of which every other college was being deprived by the Bill before the House! The Bishop of Manchester ventured to think that our colleges would be very much improved by the admission of Nonconformists, and that such admission would be a gain to the nation, to the Nonconformists themselves, and to the Church of England, which hitherto had suffered in the minds of the Nonconformists by the possession of these privileges and prerogatives.' The Right Rev. Prelate did not go on to explain why the endowment of the see of Manchester should not be shared by all the Dissenting and Roman Catholic ministers in the diocese; although, on reflection, he must have felt that the bishop of that see 'suffered in the minds of' these ministers and their congregations, so long as he remained in 'exclusive possession' of advantages in which they naturally desired to partake. It is due to the Bishop of Oxford to add that, at a later period of the debate, he resisted a motion, which was ultimately withdrawn, to abolish clerical fellowships without further delay.

The most serious effect of the University Tests Act was not that it involved a wholesale surrender of what for ages had been the property of the Church into the hands of her opponents. Had that been all, it would have been serious, but not

more serious than the confiscations of Church estates which were promoted, under whatever pretexts, by Henry VIII. The wound which it has inflicted is far more deadly than any merely material loss could be. It is that the sons of Christian parents, brought up in Christian homes, and destined, it may be, for the ministry of the Church, are placed under the moral and intellectual influence of teachers who conscientiously and avowedly reject Christianity. No one who knows Oxford will deny this effect of the Act; an effect of which its promoters were warned, in no doubtful terms, by some of those who gave evidence before a Committee of the House of Lords. To deny that Our Saviour rose from the dead is now no barrier to a tutorship; and if a tutor, whose misfortune it might be to reject such a fundamental truth of Christianity, should press his general opinion of the Christian creed more or less on the attention of his pupils, we should have no right to blame him. His pupils come to Oxford, with their eyes open, and he has as good a legal right under the Test Act to proclaim his rejection of Christianity as the Regius Professor of Divinity has to defend its doctrines. To expect such a tutor to make concessions to opinions which he regards as superstitious, when he is expressly at liberty to refuse to do so in virtue of recent legislation, and when his conceptions of truth make any such concessions at least difficult, appears to us to be unreasonable. He is not to blame, if it is his unhappy lot to rob young men of the most precious thing that a human soul can have; the blame lies with those who have placed him in a position where this supreme disaster is the natural result of an honest adherence to infidel opinions, on the part of an able teacher. Even if he never opened his lips on the question of religion, his convictions on the most interesting of all subjects could not but have weight with young men who felt that they had learned to follow him with increasing confidence in their study of lower departments of knowledge; and considering the real relations of philology, philosophy, and history to theology, it would be difficult for a highly educated and conscientious tutor not to make his religious belief obvious—not the less powerfully because indirectly—to his more intelligent pupils. If the Church's ministry is robbed, year by year, of the services of young men, who under happier circumstances would have taken holy orders; if the area of educated thought, which is not merely alien from, but hostile to, Christianity, is constantly widening; if the Church is threatened with formidable attacks upon her faith or with confiscation of her revenues by a larger and larger number of

the younger men who pass from the universities into Parliament, this is only what might be reasonably expected as a natural result of the Act of 1871.

It is probable enough that in 1871, politically speaking, the old position of the Church in the University could no longer be maintained. Lord Salisbury himself admits as much as this in the debate to which reference has been already made. But if Dissent and Infidelity were henceforth not merely to be taught but to teach in Oxford, the Church's surrender might have taken a form which would have enabled her still to provide safeguards for the faith of the sons of at least some earnest Christian parents. It was not an immodest request that out of her old inheritance of twenty colleges she might be allowed to retain four, in which her faith might not only be taught, but be safe from assault or insult; in which convictions learned from a pious mother would not be imperilled by contact with teachers who smiled at them as at old-world dreams. If such a plan was proposed, in any very deliberate manner, it was proposed in vain. The most was made of the practical difficulty of separating the colleges to be retained by the Church from the colleges to be abandoned to the sects or to the secularists. But, in the mind of the now dominant party, the real objection to the proposal lay deeper. They saw in it an attempt to limit the range of that secularized education which was already deemed to be within reach of practical achievement; they saw in it an effort to cut off the entail of confiscation which was intended to be general, and to withdraw a large body of young men from the influences which were to supplant the Faith in its ancient home. To the honour of some of the leading Dissenters be it said that they did not, at that time, demand all that the Act achieved. Dr. Allon, when giving evidence before the House of Lords, drew a distinction between property which the Church of England had owned before the Reformation, and which he conceived to have been made over to her at that date by a 'violent transfer,' and property with which she had been since endowed. He 'did not hold that the nation had an unlimited right to interfere with property left some time ago for the purposes of the Church of England.'¹ Dr. Stoughton is still more explicit. 'I have always,' he says, 'been accustomed to look at the endowments made since the Reformation, that is to say, the endowments strictly of the Episcopal Church, as being in a very different position from the endowments which

¹ *Select Committee on University Tests, 1871*, pp. 252, 253.

have been dealt with by Parliament, and which are now applied to purposes for which they were not originally intended.¹

No Churchman, of course, could acquiesce in reasoning which takes it for granted that the Church of England began to exist at the Reformation, and which denies the continuity of an organic body, because it parted with certain superficial accretions at a particular period of its history. But, from the point of view of the eminent Dissenters in question, the concession was a generous one; and it contrasts favourably with the harder measure dealt out to the Church by her non-religious opponents. Had Dr. Stoughton's language been acted on, Jesus College, Wadham College, Pembroke College, and Worcester College, must have been secured to the Church, not to speak of the many fellowships and scholarships of post-Reformation date which were to be found in a majority of the older foundations. But, as matters were settled, the Church was left with a certain position of dignified incapacity secured to her by law in all the colleges, just as the great Moguls were allowed to live on in the palace at Delhi, on condition of keeping quiet, after the establishment of British rule. The chapels, although now possibly the property of a mixed body of religionists, were still reserved for the services of the Church, and the only religious instruction required by the Act was to be in her Bible and her formularies. To a looker on, her position might still have seemed to be in some respects a strong one; and if an earnest Churchman betrayed misgivings, he was bidden to count up the number of clerical fellowships and headships, and to ask himself whether, in presence of such a host of defenders as this, his creed could be in any serious danger, even if two-thirds of the lay-fellows, or all of them, should be among the opponents of Revealed Religion.

But it would have been unreasonable to anticipate that the 'Logic of Justice,' which had already achieved such important conquests for the enemies of the Church, would stop at this point. The arguments which had opened the lay fellowships to Christian and non-Christian Dissenters were equally valid, if valid at all, against the appropriation of another set of fellowships by the clergy of 'a single denomination.' There was no reason for retaining clergy enough to defend and propagate the faith of the Church, which ought not to have barred college and university lecture-rooms against misbelieving or unbelieving teachers. Only the Girondists of the Revolution supposed that clerical fellowships

¹ *Select Committee on University Tests*, 1871, p. 332.

could be long defended. The Jacobins knew from the first what they wanted and would have. And the defenders of the old order knew that already, when the Test-Bill became law, the cause of religious education in Oxford was irretrievably lost. The only question was as to how and when the last changes would be brought about.

This question is being now decided ; and as an incident in the settlement of another question which from our point of view is relatively insignificant. A Commission was appointed, when Mr. Gladstone was last in office, to report upon the funds at the disposal of the University and Colleges, with the friendly object of dissipating exaggerated popular misconceptions as to the wealth of these bodies. This Commission presented its report after the Conservative Government had succeeded to power ; and it was generally thought that the contents of the report were of a character to make some further interference of the Legislature inevitable, with a view to securing larger educational results from the really very moderate means at the disposal of the University and its colleges. The only question was as to the persons who would direct the anticipated interference. The resident anti-Church Liberals were generally in favour of postponement ; hoping, as they did, that before long a Liberal Government would be again in power, and that a Commission after their own hearts would be appointed. Political Conservatives were as naturally anxious that the financial question should be disposed of by their own friends ; and Churchmen hoped that this might be done without raising the graver issues as to clerical fellowships, and the marriage of fellows, which were looming in the distance. It was, we believe, under pressure of this description that the late Government issued the Commission of 1877 ; and the result of that Commission, so far as it can be discounted, ought to satisfy the most enthusiastic opponents of the Church in Oxford that they would not have gained anything by waiting. Nervously anxious to be fair, the Conservative Government appointed a Commission in which Academical Liberalism was almost predominant, while the Church was much less distinctly represented than merely political Conservatism. The Government further provided that three Commissioners should be elected by each college in the University to vote with the University Commissioners when discussing the affairs of that college. Twenty years ago such a provision would have secured the religious character of nine colleges out of ten. In the present circumstances of Oxford it was fatal.

But this was not all. No sooner was the Commission introduced into the House of Lords, than a demonstration was made by some young Liberal peers against still-remaining clerical safeguards of the religious character of the colleges. Perhaps the Government was too much occupied with the Eastern question to give the matter much serious thought. Certain it is that the Ministers gave way; and the Commission, instead of being a body bound to preserve the existing relations of the University to the Church, but empowered to dispose of her revenues with a view to the better promotion of learning and education, found itself under the necessity of deciding between the Church and her opponents, as to her claim to retain what yet was hers in the colleges of Oxford. It was easy from the first to divine the issue; as some even of the Conservative members of the Commission, however devoted to the policy of Lord Beaconsfield, were understood to vote against the Church whenever her spiritual influence and usefulness was at stake. The religious element was strengthened at a later date by the appointment of the Rev. O. Gordon, tutor and censor of Christ Church, who brought real knowledge of Oxford to the task before the Commissioners; and Lord Selborne would have had the higher interests of religion at heart. But soon after the change of Government last year, Lord Selborne retired from the chairmanship of the Commission, and the vacancy was taken by the Master of University College, who was believed to be more or less in alliance with the anti-Church party. The result is now, at least in its main features, before the University.

The clerical fellowships are practically gone. Certainly the Commissioners provide that one clerical fellow shall be generally retained, except in S. John's and Magdalen, where two are allowed, and in Christ Church, where three students are to be in holy orders. But it is already understood that this almost worthless concession will be successfully opposed in the House of Commons; while Churchmen feel that it is hardly worth defending. The single clerical fellow in a common-room of the future, elected by a body of lay electors to recite services in a chapel which they never attend, and to give religious instructions to which they would refer, if at all, in terms of gentlemanly scorn, would be a mere pariah, wholly incapable of representing the interests of religion with any good practical effect. He would also be a standing argument against electing any clergyman, actual or probable, however capable or accomplished, to a vacant fellowship;

he would be a 'grievance,' chiefly valuable to the Church's opponents for oratorical purposes, whenever a new assault was to be made on the little that might still be left to her in Oxford. But, assuming that Parliament ratifies the proposals of the Commissioners, the result may be exhibited in the subjoined table, in which the number of clerical heads and fellows in 1854¹ is contrasted first with the numbers as reported in the Calendar for 1881, and next with the number which is required by the Commissioners, so far as their intentions are as yet known. It is instructive to observe how completely in some colleges the secularizing policy of the Commission has been anticipated, by applications to the Privy Council, or in whatever other way, during the years that preceded 1877.

Colleges	Clerical Members of Foundations in 1854	Clerical Members of Foundations in 1881	Clerical Members of Foundations insisted on by the Commission
University .	Master and 6 fellows .	Master and 2 fellows .	Not settled
Balliol .	Master and 8 fellows .	Master, 1 fellow, and chaplain	1 fellow
Merton .	8 fellows	4 fellows	Not settled
Exeter .	Rector and 14 fellows .	Rector and 3 fellows .	1 fellow
Oriel .	Provost and 7 fellows .	Provost and 4 fellows .	1 fellow
Queen's .	Provost and 23 fellows .	Provost and 8 fellows .	1 fellow
New .	Warden, 28 fellows, and 10 chaplains . .	Warden, 6 fellows, and 3 chaplains . .	Not settled
Lincoln .	Rector and 10 fellows .	Rector and 4 fellows .	None
All Souls' .	Warden and 14 fellows	Warden, 3 fellows, and 1 chaplain . . .	No fellows and 2 chaplains
Magdalen .	President, 33 fellows, and 4 chaplains .	President, 14 fellows, and 4 chaplains .	2 fellows and 4 chaplains
Brasenose .	Principal and 16 fellows	Principal and 4 fellows	Not settled
Corpus .	President, 18 fellows, and 2 chaplains .	President and 3 fellows	No fellows and 2 chaplains
Christ Church .	Dean, 8 canons, 43 students, and 8 chaplains	Dean, 6 canons, 18 students, and 6 chaplains	Dean, 6 canons, 3 students, & 6 chaplains
Trinity .	President and 8 fellows.	President and 3 fellows	1 fellow
S. John's .	President, 24 fellows, and 1 chaplain . .	President and 12 fellows	Not settled
Jesus .	Principal and 17 fellows	Principal and 5 fellows	1 fellow
Wadham .	Warden, 8 fellows, and 2 chaplains . .	Warden, 2 fellows, and chaplain	Not settled
Pembroke .	Master and 12 fellows .	Master and 3 fellows .	Not settled
Worcester .	Provost and 19 fellows	Provost and 8 fellows .	Not settled
Keble .	—	Warden and 5 tutors	Untouched
Hertford .	—	Principal and 7 fellows	Not settled

As yet the Commissioners have only published the pro-

¹ We have taken these numbers from the Oxford Calendar for that year.

posed new statutes of eleven colleges. But it is not difficult to trace the principle upon which the new arrangements proceeded. Where clerical fellowships have been prescribed by the statutes they are cut down to one, in all colleges except three. Where they have not been expressly prescribed, or have been recently dispensed with by the Privy Council, they are not required by the Commission. Thus, none are insisted on at All Souls', Lincoln, and Corpus. Probably none will be required at Merton, New College, and Wadham; while a single fellow in holy orders will appear at University, Brasenose, and Worcester; two at S. John's; and at Pembroke, the mastership being united to a canonry at Gloucester, one fellow and the master.

Our readers will bear in mind that the eleven new schemes for college statutes to which we refer, although circulated in the University, have not necessarily assumed their final form; they may be altered before being laid on the table of the House. Parliament can only accept, or reject them, as a whole. But they represent, not the worst we have to expect, but the best for which we can reasonably hope; and it is difficult, as we think, to exaggerate their grave significance.

It is obvious to remark that the Commissioners insist upon a single clerical fellow as a minimum, but that there is nothing to prevent a college from electing a larger number of clergymen if it chooses to do so. No one who has lived much in Oxford of late years would allow himself to derive serious comfort from a consideration like this. The reason why clergymen of ability and culture will not be elected to vacant fellowships is simply because the candidates are clergymen, or laymen who are likely to be ordained. Mr. Wordsworth observes, in his excellent pamphlet, that

'the fear of "clericalism" is a fact among us, and is likely to prejudice the elections to fellowships, perhaps for some time to come. Experience certainly seems to show that when the number of clerical fellows has been reduced to a fixed and necessary minimum, that minimum has tended to become the actual maximum. And as the divergence of opinion inside a college grows stronger, men holding "erroneous and strange doctrines" are not likely to be inclined to admit those into partnership who have taken, or will take, a vow at their ordination to banish and drive away such doctrines.'—p. 6.

Naturally they are not. Indeed, we have heard the opinion naïvely propounded that 'the intention to take orders is of itself so decisive a proof of intellectual inferiority as to dispense with the necessity of an examination'; and we suspect that this opinion is held by a larger number of 'laymen'

in Oxford than would care to express it. It is, of course, possible that the purely commercial instinct of a governing body, anxious to meet the demands of Christian parents who still wish their sons to be under the care of Christian teachers, may in some cases modify the wholesale proscription of clergymen which is otherwise to be expected. But this is hardly probable. At least, we, for our parts, should not think worse of a freethinking college, which preferred emptying its rooms and reducing the pay of its tutors, to encouraging, by its elections, a stupid superstition, such as it might deem the creed of the Church of Christ to be. It must further be remembered that clerical elections to fellowships will hereafter be regarded by Protestant Dissenters with the utmost jealousy. Dissenters are almost powerless to achieve anything in the University on behalf of those portions of Divine Revelation which they themselves hold to be precious and sacred; but they have great power, politically speaking, to check anything that would make the Church again religiously effective, and recent experience leads us to fear that they would use it.

We shall be reminded that a man is not necessarily an unbeliever because he does not take holy orders. We gladly assent. Among Oxford tutors, of late, there have been laymen such as Mr. A. C. Madan, of Christchurch, who last year threw up his tutorship to join the Central African Mission: a man whose saintly and apostolic life even devoted clergymen might well envy, if envy were permissible. But is this what is generally meant by a 'layman,' in modern Oxford? Is a 'layman,' as a rule, a devout Churchman, who has only not taken orders because he has not been sure of having a true vocation, or because he has shrunk from the awful responsibilities of a cure of souls? Is he not rather, and commonly, an educated man, of whom nothing is known except that he possesses the great negative merit, as it is now deemed, of not being a clergyman; a man whose convictions on the most solemn of all points that can interest a human being are, perhaps, either sedulously wrapped in mystery, or just sufficiently disclosed to satisfy those who care to know that they are opposed to the dearest truths for which Christians have lived and died; a man whom you are very glad to talk with on some indifferent literary topic, but whom you would never think of going to in a great heart-ache, in a moral entanglement, or in the day of sickness and amidst the shadows of possibly approaching death. There are many occasions on which a tutor may be the only person who can render the highest and most sacred pastoral services

to a resident undergraduate ; and what is too likely to happen, when modern 'laymen' are almost the only tutors in Oxford, we leave our readers to imagine.

We must confess to astonishment at the levity—we can use no gentler term—with which the loss of clerical endowments in Oxford has been treated by some Churchmen, or by writers who profess to represent their opinions. The subject is dismissed with the remark that no Churchmen, with a sincere belief in God's providence and protection, can suppose that the cause of the faith in Oxford depends upon the retention of a few clerical fellowships and headships ; or we are reminded of one or two surviving specimens of 'port-wine fellows of the præ-Tractarian type,' who in their day, rode, shot, fished, hunted, danced, did everything except the work of a student, or the work of a priest, and whose tone is not such as to recommend religion to thoughtful young men. We protest against the implied position, that the majority of fellows of colleges were at any time men of this description ; or that any order of men can be equitably judged of by the minority which only represents its defects or its vices. Nor does a Christian cease to believe in God's protecting providence, guiding the destinies of His Church in this changeful world, because he also believes that God works through accredited agencies, and that, when these agencies are deliberately suspended or withdrawn, He does not commonly supply their place by any extraordinary interposition, but allows the laws of His ordinary government of the world to take their course. Especially is this the case in His dealings with individuals or with bodies of men who reject the agencies by which truth makes its way and holds its own amidst the varied passions of men ; He punishes them by leaving them to the natural consequences of their own acts. The strongest objection to the academical clergy is that they represent ideas of which men would fain be well rid in an atmosphere of materialized thought ; they represent an Unseen Master, and a supernatural world and a judgment to come, and they are correspondingly unwelcome. Clerical fellows may, as a class, have fallen very far short of the ideal set before them by pious founders, and of the great opportunities placed within their reach, but their virtual suppression appears to us to rank with those efforts to banish the witnesses of God's merciful but importunate Presence, of which there are examples in sacred history, and which cannot but now be, as they are said to have been heretofore, offensive to Him. If we cannot adopt all of Dean Burgon's language on the

subject it is only because his style of controversy is not ours; with the spirit of his earnest protest on behalf of the honour of our Divine Master we entirely sympathize.

Mr. Wordsworth has some very thoughtful remarks on the value of clerical fellowships, which we commend to the attention of any of our readers who may take it for granted that a clerical fellow is necessarily less useful and of a lower intellectual type than a layman.¹ But he also calls attention to a subject which will become important, when the number of clerical fellows has been reduced to the projected minimum, or when they have, as is probable, virtually disappeared. We mean the teaching of theology by laymen. Some theology, we suppose, will still be taught, at least for some time, even to undergraduates who are not going into the theological school. It will be hereafter a question for Christian parents to consider whether a college lecturer in the Holy Gospels believes Christianity to be true, or supposes himself to be 'commenting upon the literature of an extinct religion.' Even in the case of a believing and Christian layman, we must think that he had better, as a rule, teach philosophy or history than divinity. As Mr. Wordsworth truly observes—

'The accredited ministers of a religion are the natural persons to explain its Scriptures, and to show the meaning and relevancy of the currents of religious thought and controversy, and the social movements which make up its history. A merely philological knowledge of the Bible, and a positivist view of Church history, is worse than useless.'²

Again Mr. Wordsworth reminds his correspondent: 'I must again draw your attention to the fact that *the Christian layman is now unknown to our statutes*, and that unless you appoint a clergyman you have no security for the character of the teaching delivered from the professional chair.'³

In fact, since the date of the Tests Act, 1871, the clerical fellowships have represented the *ascertained* Churchmanship, nay, the *ascertained* Christianity, of the teaching body at Oxford. We are as far as possible from denying that the real area of believing minds is not considerably wider than that of the clerical contingent; but, since 1871, there has been no public guarantee whatever as to the religious principles of anyone in Oxford who is not in holy orders. The effect of the Test Act was to identify the interests of the Church of England with the maintenance of the clerical fellowships to

¹ *The Church and the Universities*: a Letter, p. 15.

² *Ibid.* p. 19.

³ *Ibid.*

an extent which had never been the case before ; and their suppression, disguise it from ourselves as we may, means, as her opponents know full well, her defeat and disaster in a place which for ages has been her chief stronghold in the country.

We have heard it suggested that the loss of clerical fellowships might be to some extent redressed by the establishment of a certain number of theological fellowships, that is to say, of fellowships assigned to those who may have passed the best examination in theology. As it would be now impossible to oblige such fellows to take holy orders in the Church of England these new fellowships might well represent every form of faith and unbelief ; they would be given simply to the man who showed the largest knowledge of his subject. That they would not unfrequently fall into the hands of Churchmen, we will not allow ourselves to doubt ; but they would also fall, not unfrequently, into the hands of very accomplished unbelievers—to say nothing of Protestant Dissenters of whatever description. The latter, we suspect, would have the smaller share in them. Schleiermacher remarks somewhere that great love and great hatred are the two motives which really lead men to study the canon of Scripture ; and his remark is equally applicable to all departments of theological science. Such fellowships might quicken theological controversy ; they would do little for religious truth. They would extend the idea, already too prevalent, that the Christian creed is what so many of the Gnostics thought it : an addition to the intellectual amusements of the world, rather than a rule of faith and life. A fellowship which might be held in succession by an English Churchman, a Roman Catholic, a Baptist, a Socinian, a Deist, a Pantheist, and an Atheist, provided only that the holder could have shown sufficient knowledge of what had been written and thought about the Old and New Testaments and the creed of Christendom, would not help young men in Oxford to believe that there was any fixed truth by which to rule their passions and direct their lives. We, for our parts, would gladly forego the encouragement which such fellowships might give to theological study in view of the injury they would almost inevitably inflict upon the cause of practical religion.

The secularization of the headships, with the two exceptions of Christ Church and Pembroke, may at first sight appear a matter of comparatively small consequence ; as the Heads of Houses, in many cases, have not had much intimate contact with the younger and practical life of the University. But surely it is not unimportant that the highest place in a

number of institutions with which young men are associated during the most impressible years of life should be filled by a representative of religion; and any man who has observed how greatly we are influenced by the unobtrusive circumstances which surround life, and on the whole, in the ratio of their intrinsic significance, will be ready to do justice to this consideration. Not that the importance to the Church of the clerical character of the Heads of Houses is to be estimated only or chiefly by their presumed effect, as picturesque but distant objects, upon the imagination of young men. Many of them, as we have reason to know, have made, and do make, noble use of the opportunities which their position supplies, to the advantage of their fellow men and to the glory of God. The 'Heads' of this generation would hardly repeat the errors of their predecessors in the last, when dealing with the Tractarians. And as yet, with one exception, they are all clergymen: in this particular old Oxford still survives. We have time to prepare ourselves for the contrast which their successors will inevitably present, and to regret from our hearts that it should be imminent.

It is worth while to observe that the Heads of Houses are, to an extent of which few people are aware, trustees; and that the trust which has been reposed in them is thus reposed because their permanently clerical character has been taken for granted. Thus, for example, they are, by the Rev. John Bampton's will, electors to the lecture which bears his name, and which, in the hands of men like Mansel or Mozley, has had decisive influence upon the thought of Oxford. In the same way they elect the Ireland Professor of Exegesis. When Dean Ireland founded that chair, he felt his general intentions to be so safe in the hands of a clerical board of electors, that he actually omitted to state in his will that the Professor should be a clergyman of the Church of England. There is, of course, no room for doubt as to his intention: a lay professor of divinity—of whose faith no account would be taken, if only he had sufficient knowledge—never presented himself to Dean Ireland's imagination. But when eighteen out of the twenty heads of colleges are 'laymen'—in the modern, as distinct from the religious, sense of the term—whom will they not elect to the Chair of Exegesis? When perhaps a majority of these electors come to be of opinion that Christianity is not from God, will they be able, as conscientious men, to administer a bequest like that of Canon Bampton in the way best calculated to promote the objects he had at heart? Is it not plain, in these as in other instances, that pending changes,

involving the secularization of the headships, mean nothing less than the surrender of the Church's defences in Oxford into the hands of her opponents, and that to treat such changes as unimportant is to deny either the value of religion or the significance of facts?

Of less importance, from our point of view, is the permission to marry, which the Commissioners are giving to a majority of the fellows of colleges; insisting upon celibacy only in cases where college work requires it, and while it is so required. We have always felt that there are grave reasons against insisting on prolonged celibacy in the case of young laymen; and if such a requirement could be relaxed, without detriment to the interests for which the colleges of Oxford mainly exist, we should not protest against the relaxation. If a man is to agree with Hooker that a 'single life is a thing more angelical and divine'¹ than a married one, and to act on the conviction with safety to himself and profit to others, he must have surrendered himself to great convictions which, we must fear, have now no great weight with young fellows of colleges in Oxford. When therefore it was resolved that Oxford in the future should be 'lay,' it was prudent to resolve also that it should, as far as possible, be 'married.' But if men who generally approve of other changes now in progress are to be trusted, this concession is being granted much more widely than public interests would suggest. The question now is not who is going to be married, but who is not. Young men denounce the celibate fellowships as a foolish relic of 'mediævalism,' and they descant on the advantages which will accrue to undergraduates from a large admixture of ladies' society. But to lookers on it may well occur that if the revenues of the colleges are spent in maintaining a large additional number of wives and families, they cannot be spent upon the direct requirements of education, or on the prosecution of research; while, it may also be questioned whether a great reinforcement of the corps of ladies who already occupy Oxford so imposingly would, on the whole, be favourable to habits of study in undergraduates of the average type. That occasional opportunities of meeting ladies in society have a refining and valuable influence on a young man's character, we take for granted; but instead of the families of the Heads of Houses and professors, and a few senior tutors, as of yore, it is now a question of a population of ladies, who may make serious demands on the time of young men.

¹ *Ecc. Pol.* v. 73, 1.

In the smaller colleges, too, the question of residence on the part of the tutors of the future is a practical difficulty, which would appear to have engaged the serious attention of the Commissioners. The danger of a college, with a staff of married tutors living in the Parks, is lest its buildings should become, first of all, a very undisciplined boarding-house, and later on, by way of reaction, should be turned into a collection of family residences; the undergraduates being for the most part sent into lodgings. Apart from these considerations it is plain that the financial difficulties of the new system will be excessive; and that it will be impossible to shelve a married lay tutor, who may have outlived his freshness and usefulness as a teacher of young men, except by resorting, at ruinous cost, to a system of pensions, which will only reproduce, under another name, the 'useless senior fellow' of a past generation. Indeed, this whole matter would appear to ourselves to have been decided in obedience to the natural wishes of young Fellows rather than to those considerations of prudence and foresight which the care of a great institution like Oxford should inspire; and we shall not be surprised if the present generation of University reformers is hereafter accused of having sacrificed the interests of learning and education, in a greater degree than has really been the case, to the private tastes of a passing generation of trustees. Is it altogether improbable that before the next century is far advanced in its course, another University Commission will be required to undo some of the mistakes that are being sanctioned now? We are not prophets; but we cannot help hoping that the misapplication, as we think it, of University funds to domestic purposes on a great scale will thus have some day to be reconsidered under circumstances, when religion may plead, with more success than she can at present, for her share in institutions which are, with scarcely an exception, her own creations. The immediate future, however, is, as we fear, a dark one; and things are likely to get worse before they improve. Let us consider what will be left to the Church in Oxford, so far as can at present be anticipated, when the decisions of the Commissioners, as interpreted practically by the present governing bodies, have taken effect.

Of her ancient inheritance in Oxford the Church still retains the use of the college chapels, and the Faculty of Divinity. Will she retain them for long?

The Tests Act of 1871 provides for the continuance of the Church service, or of an abridgment of it, in the chapels of the several colleges. This provision has not yet been cha-

lenged, partly because the great majority of the undergraduates are the sons of Church parents, and partly because the full effects of recent legislation have not yet had time to make themselves apparent in the *personnel* of the governing bodies of the several colleges. But the recent adoption of the roll-call in some of the largest colleges in Oxford will, in all probability, quickly establish an argument against the daily use of the chapels for religious services. It has been generally adopted in order to insist on a certain measure of discipline in the matter of getting up in the morning, while relieving dissenting undergraduates from the necessity of attending a service in which they could not conscientiously join. But, practically, it has done a great deal besides; and in more than one large college in Oxford, where no active encouragement, to say the least, is given to the religion of the Church, the number of undergraduates who attend chapel is already insignificant. What is likely to happen when, perhaps, two-thirds or three-fourths of the members of the governing body of a small college are, for whatever reason, professed dissentients from the English Church? Will they continue to allow the most commodious and interesting building in their college to be appropriated exclusively, or at all, to the use of those who sympathize with a small minority of its temporary owners? The case, it may be replied, is analogous to that of a parish church, say in certain districts of Wales, which is owned by the parish, yet used by only a small minority of the population. But such a parish is part of a larger whole, and until the condition of things which it presents becomes that of the Church and country generally, the fabric will continue to be used as it is. Whereas each college will have means of applying to the Privy Council or to some supreme tribunal for the redress of grievances or the correction of anomalies; and, the Act of Parliament notwithstanding, we may expect before long to find Church of England undergraduates in some colleges provided with worship, if they like to attend it, at some neighbouring parish Church, while the college chapel is turned into a library, or a museum of antiquities, or a lecture room.

Indeed the 'logic of justice' which, with its bold and fallacious assumptions, has already revolutionized Oxford, has clearly as good a case against the retention of the chapels by the Church as it had against the clerical fellowships. There is no more reason why the one right should be retained or forfeited than the other; and the same thing must be said of the Faculty of Theology. We scarcely dare to hope that these

professorships, although attached to canonries, will long be allowed to remain in the possession of the Church; indeed, no less a person than Professor Bryce has already proposed that the chairs of Hebrew and Ecclesiastical History should be held by laymen, *i.e.* it is necessary to remember, possibly by dissenting ministers, possibly by persons who, like M. Renan, are devoted to Semitic or ecclesiastical studies, yet have no belief whatever in a personal and moral God. Such a proposal, coming from such a quarter, shows us what is to be apprehended; since Professor Bryce's opinions are tempered by great intellectual and moral characteristics, which can by no means be looked for as a matter of course in those who share them.

On the other hand, it is a question whether some of the remains of the system of old Oxford which yet survive can be considered altogether advantages; whether they do not disguise the real character of recent changes from the eyes of the country. A secular system had better look secular, and then people know what they are doing in making use of it, and they take the precautions which are natural to Christians. The University sermons appear to us to be, under present circumstances, of more than doubtful value; and we have thought that their place would be well supplied by carefully arranged courses of sermons during term-time in the parish churches, among which S. Mary's, we need not say, is one. University sermons are not so arranged as to exert any powerful moral or spiritual influence on the great body of the undergraduates; the contradictory utterances in the University pulpit are often a source of spiritual perplexity to one set of young men, while they afford matter for scornful pleasantries to another. But it is too possible that a claim will be advanced, at no distant date, for the admittance of other preachers than the clergy of the English Church to the University pulpit, in order to satisfy the tastes of other religious bodies. Our main safety against this desecration of the University church, probably, lies in the difficulty of drawing any line, consistently with the received theories of 'justice.' The Roman Catholics would not care to avail themselves of the permission; or Dr. Newman might again be heard in the building which will ever be associated with his name. But to occupy the University pulpit would probably be an object of ambition to leading dissenting ministers; and if one is admitted we must admit all. Dr. Punshon and Mr. Spurgeon would be followed by Mr. Martineau and Mr. Francis Newman, nay, by Mr. Frederic Harrison. Positivism has as

much right as Socinianism, Socinianism as Congregationalism or Wesleyanism, within the Church's walls; and the lower we descend in the scale of faith, when we have passed outside the Church, the more intellectual, as a rule, are the preachers, and the more likely to interest an academical audience. This difficulty may for a time guard the University pulpit against the intrusion of Dissenters, Christian and non-Christian; but we fail to understand how the existing University sermons are paid for consistently with accepted theories. Unless we are misinformed, the preachers are remunerated out of the proceeds of a tax which is levied upon all the undergraduates; and those among the undergraduates who are not members of the Church might apparently have a right to object to paying towards the support of preachers of a faith which they conscientiously reject.

It is, for obvious reasons, difficult to discuss different classes in the University; but a recent writer in the *Guardian*¹ has relieved us of the most delicate part of our task, and he evidently writes with the advantages of large experience. He is comparing the present fellows and tutors with their predecessors. The modern 'Don'

'is (we are speaking of the average specimen) much younger, more hardworking, of wider interests, and greater intellectual activity; a restless Reformer instead of a contented Conservative, with aims and views of life altogether different. He is not, as a rule, in holy orders, and cannot therefore subside into that sleepy, hum-drum attitude of waiting for a college living to drop, which used to paralyse the exertions of so many college fellows—men, perhaps, of good natural parts, to whom a small immediate independence, with the prospect of an income to be had only by waiting for it, was probably the greatest curse that could have befallen them.'

The writer thinks that the modern fellow, although exposed to the temptations of idleness, will not 'become a rake or a sot, as too many college fellows did in the old days; he is more likely now to become a tée-totaller or a vegetarian;' but he asks, as he wonderingly contemplates the vices and shortcomings of the past, if, when the qualities which are the secret of success are in danger of rusting from disuse, now,

'when most college fellows are expected to do, and do, some work though not of a very arduous kind; what must it have been when few were expected to do, and still fewer did, any work at all?'

That is, indeed, a profound speculation, and our guide does

¹ *Guardian*, February 23, 1881: 'Dons Past and Present,' by One of them.

not venture into its depths. He conducts us airily to the average Oxford common-room :—

‘The clerical and conservative tone which used to pervade the common-rooms has somewhat evaporated. Few of the party are clerical even in name and outward dress ; while of those who still prefix “Rev.” to their names, the majority seem to be in sympathy with opinions, political *and theological*, which in old-fashioned country manor houses and parsonages are still regarded as almost inspired by the evil one.’

Our own recollections and observations would have led to an additional reflection. Thirty years ago the tone of common-room society was characterized by a respect for disinterested motives, which, somehow, has largely disappeared. Whether it be the study of Mr. Mill’s philosophy, or the disappearance of faith in those Divine objects of thought and motives to action which do indisputably raise and refine human life, it is certain that the material aspects of life count for more in daily conversation between Oxford residents than used to be the case, and young men profess entirely selfish aims without the apology which, in former days, would have been thought due to the atmosphere around them. The writer before us owns incidentally that he has ‘not lived among the older generation of Dons,’ although he seems to have no doubt about their general degradation as compared with his own contemporaries ; and yet even he doubts whether ‘they thought themselves so dreadfully hard worked, and Oxford so terribly unhealthy, as most of my brethren do now.’ This doubt appears to us to be justified ; and we agree with him further, when he says of the modern fellow, that there

‘is not much danger of his becoming a prejudiced Conservative, incapable of any new ideas. He is more likely to be an intellectual weathercock, turning with every wind of new teaching ; now worshipping the last professional utterance from Germany, or the newest manifesto from Birmingham, and, like Horace’s Balatro, *suspendens omnia naso*.’

Indeed, the writer offers an opinion which we should not have ourselves ventured to express, but from which it is not altogether easy to dissent :—

‘Intellectual bumptiousness, if I may use the expression, is a danger to which many of my friends are exposed ; and intellectual bumptiousness is too often mistaken for intellectual strength.’

Altogether, the recorded experience of this ‘Don’ would appear to us to be more accurate than the comparisons or the inferences which he connects with it ; and the picture which

it affords us of the modern Oxford tone and life is not such as to lead those whose memories run back for more than a quarter of a century to conclude that we have gained so much by an age of academical revolution as its promoters sometimes maintain.

That something has been won in directions other than religious or moral we do not deny. The range of intellectual interests of a modern Oxford College fellow is generally wider than was his predecessor's; and he is freer from narrow prejudices which often disturbed a literary, or even a moral, judgment in bygone days. He has almost always seen the greater part of the continent, possibly, too, Asia or America. Modern languages used to be so rare an accomplishment that when Dr. Pusey was appointed to the Regius Chair of Hebrew, it was said that only two Oxford residents really understood German; whereas now German is read as generally as French, if not more so. If conversation is sometimes pedantic, it is often very interesting and instructive; and within the University much irregular impulse is given to special studies by associations, formed with a view to their prosecution, and calculated to foster enthusiasm for all original work. Nor must the writer, whom we quoted just now, lead us to forget that among those who have least in common with the old Faith and Life of the Church are to be found characters so gentle, winning, and unselfish, as to forbid any unqualified estimate even of those features in modern Oxford which a sincere Churchman must most deeply regret.

We have reason to believe that the influence which the Church exercises upon a section of the undergraduates is, notwithstanding all that has been said, still considerable. Many a young Churchman holds and practises his creed with as much intelligence and consistency as his father did thirty years ago. The pupils of the Tractarian leaders are now parents of grown-up families: and many a young man comes to Oxford from a religious home or a Church school, bringing with him a definite faith and knowing at least something of what may be said in its favour. He will be happy if he should read for honours in the *Literæ Humaniores* School and not lose his faith in making his first acquaintance with modern philosophy. This danger does not await the ordinary passmen; but among passmen, who have had no early religious training, we fear that a large number of undergraduates are almost entirely uninfluenced by religion during their Oxford life. In this respect the University presents an unfavourable contrast to its condition thirty years ago. In estimating the influence of

the Church in a place like Oxford it may be assumed that a minority of young men will be earnest Christians in all circumstances, even the most unfavourable. It may be also assumed that a somewhat larger minority will, in all circumstances, even the most favourable to religion, be resolutely irreligious. But there is a great intermediate body, much outnumbering these two minorities put together, which is powerfully acted upon by the dominant influences around it, for good or for evil, as the case may be. Thirty years ago the Church was strong enough in Oxford to affect this intermediate zone of men very effectively for good. At the present day, we fear, she acts upon it only feebly, if at all; the influences which rule in Oxford, and which naturally control it, are other than hers.

Mr. Wordsworth's remarks upon the proportion of undergraduates who take holy orders will be read with interest:—

'I have calculated that, at any time for about ten years back, some 550 of our undergraduates, or considerably more than a fifth of the whole body in residence, were *bonâ fide* candidates for ordination. I may further remark that in my own College (Brasenose) about four-ninths of our graduates have been ordained during the same period. And I see no reason to think that, unless they are positively discouraged, these numbers will decrease.'¹

It must, at the same time, we fear, be admitted that the mental atmosphere of Oxford is not favourable to the formation of resolutions to serve God in the most sacred of callings. Even when some older man does not drop a hint to an undergraduate of wavering purpose 'not to throw himself away by becoming a parson,' the public opinion of the undergraduate world itself discourages ordination rather than not. It is a natural result of the unsettled and sceptical temper which is the product of many modern influences, and which the Broad Church teachers have done so much to foster. Indeed, when we consider the prevalence of this temper among young men, the wonder is not that so few, but that so many, take holy orders. While theology is persistently represented to a young man as surrounded by uncertainties as to subjects confessedly of the first importance, his attention is challenged either by critical studies in which nothing whatever depends upon arriving at certainty, or by the physical sciences with their imposing display of conclusions resting directly on observation and experiment. Can we wonder that he prefers studies in which nothing is risked by doubt,

¹ *The Church and the Universities*, p. 13.

or in which knowledge is as sure as the senses of man can make it? Until the prevalence of a positive and Catholic temper and method in our theological teaching restores a confidence which has been shattered by the negative criticism, we must expect many young men, who under happier circumstances would be ordained, to shrink from committing themselves to a venture, which common sense and piety may seem to them to discredit.

The theological school was established some years ago in the hope, to use Dr. Pusey's words at the time, of 'saving theology from being crushed out by the pressure of new subjects.' It has not as yet proved a success. It has shared the unpopularity of the Church in 'Liberal' common-rooms, and the most influential tutors throughout the University have explicitly or tacitly discouraged it. Very few men of the highest order of ability have read for this school; while examiners have been anxious, rightly as we hold, to make the high honours in it represent at least the same amount of work and ability that they do in the school of *Literæ Humaniores*. The consequence is that few high honours have been gained in it at all, and it has a bad name among the undergraduates. They say that it means more work and less credit than the school of *Literæ Humaniores*.

For ourselves we are not sorry, in the interest of theology itself, that, if a man's faith can be preserved unimpaired, his intellect should be whetted on the subjects studied for the final classical school, before he touches theology. The mind had better make its first experiments in philology on some less precious subject than the text of either Testament, and its first efforts at philosophical thought in other questions than those which arise out of Christian dogma and ethics.

It seems possible, too, that the Divinity professors may have, of late years, done something less than justice to the real import of their chairs, in their natural anxiety to assist the School of Theology by lecturing with a view to the examinations in it. We have sometimes thought that a more disinterested treatment of their subjects, addressed to older minds, would perhaps in the long run be of more service to Christian theology. Certainly the theological school does not afford any measure whatever either of the number of candidates for Orders, or of the extent to which theology is studied at Oxford: although it is of course possible that it may do so more generally in years to come.

There are certain practical religious influences at work in Oxford which will occur to everyone. Of the parish churches

in Oxford at least four are in the hands of Low Church trustees ; and S. Aldate's, together with Wycliffe Hall, is the centre of such influence as 'evangelicalism' can wield. So far as this influence is in a positive direction, making the most of such truth as it knows, and not wasting its strength in stirring up controversial passions against Churchmen who hold the larger and more consistent creed which the Prayer Book teaches, we may wish it well. Among sources of religious influence with which we have more sympathy it is natural to remember the venerable Dr. Pusey, almost entirely confined to two rooms in his house by the infirmities of his eighty years, but still giving proof from time to time that his soul's eye is not dim, nor its natural force abated, and exercising a commanding moral power over any who are directly or indirectly brought into contact with him. The professor of Pastoral Theology, Dr. King, is one of those rare characters in whom sympathy is nothing less than a form of genius ; while Dr. Bright has already made, and is still more likely to make, the Chair of Church History in Oxford famous as it has never yet been since its foundation, for accurate and thorough scholarship in intimate harmony with the wide and generous yet cautious instincts of a Churchman's faith. Nor, in this connexion, may we forget Keble College, whose name is in itself an appeal to a Churchman's heart. Keble has been fortunate in meeting with a warden, who combines the faith of a Christian with very high intellectual ability, and the lower but not unimportant advantages of gentle birth and good connections. To ourselves he appears to have given proof of remarkable skill as an administrator ; he has, within ten years, made his college one of the four largest in Oxford ; while, as an educational success, it altogether now transcends the boldest flights of fancy in which its projectors ever ventured to indulge. There are undoubtedly some other encouraging features in the religious side of Oxford life. Among these may be mentioned the increased interest which is taken in Church missions to the heathen, and to the heathenized population of our large cities, by a section of graduate and undergraduate residents. The Oxford mission to Calcutta is a noble and most promising result of this form of Christian enthusiasm ; while the Central African Mission, after a long period of relatively unproductive struggles, has quite lately commanded an amount of practical sympathy both in Oxford and Cambridge which warrants the best hopes for its future success. And we have lately heard that the undergraduates of Christ Church, encouraged by some of its tutors, have made a serious

effort to strengthen the Bishop of Bedford's hands in the east end of London.

On the other hand it is necessary to bear in mind that, of the sources of good to which we have adverted, many are strictly personal and transient, while among them some, like Dr. Pusey, will never be replaced. They belong to the old Oxford rather than to the new; and their present activity is, perhaps, to a certain extent due to a sense of the graver issues involved in the changes through which we are passing. Keble College, to be sure, would seem to be secured to the Church by the constitution of its council: but, without forgetting the success which it owes, as we have said, under God, so largely, to the warden and his accomplished fellow-workers, we should like to be sure that the religious temper of its undergraduates is altogether such as its name would imply; that, in this respect, it presents a marked contrast to the older, secularized or semi-secularized, colleges; and that there is no ground for the apprehension that in modern Oxford the general atmosphere of the University must be fatal sooner or later to the distinctively Church spirit of a new college, on the ground that in it academical interests 'will always in the long run take precedence of the interests' of the kingdom and faith of Christ.

It has occurred to us sometimes that the future needs of young Churchmen in the secularized colleges of Oxford would be most effectively provided for by colleges of priests, living in community, but under no strict rule, and in houses having no connexion with the colleges or the University. They might or might not themselves be University men. They would devote themselves to everything that interested undergraduates; to their studies, their occupations, their moral and spiritual needs. That a college of older men, with high and disinterested aims, might powerfully affect young Oxford for good, we do not doubt; and we hope that God may put it into the heart of some one who happens to read these lines to consider whether such a form of service as this may not at the present time be the most useful in which he can personally engage. Whatever else changes, the minds and characters of young men remain, generation after generation, the most interesting things, by far, in a place like Oxford; always fresh, hopeful, generous, grateful for the least efforts to serve them, and offering a field of labour which is, in the moral and spiritual sense of the term, more remunerative perhaps than any other.

It will perhaps be said that some of the foregoing remarks

are the cries of a pessimist. Pessimism is a nickname, if it does not describe a deliberate philosophy; and in philosophy we are as far as possible from being pessimists. The question before us is not the cause of truth and virtue in the Universe at large, but the present and apparently future circumstances of the English Church in Oxford. We cannot be insincere: the prospect is, to a great extent, a dark one. The days are gone when those who knew the real state of the case could talk of Oxford as one of the 'eyes' of the Church, or could do other than smile when they read the conventional, or sometimes the almost mystical, utterances of Episcopal and other authorities on the subject. The plain truth is that henceforth Oxford will belong to the Church of England just as much and just as little as does the House of Commons. It is still a centre of social and intellectual interests; but as a centre of religious force it is no longer what it was, and is unlikely in the future to be what it still is. God can take care of His own cause, no doubt; but it is our business to note what He permits to traverse it, and to act accordingly. We should indeed be sorry, if anything which we have here written should lead any man to whom God has given the means of doing good work in the secularized University of later years to abandon his post. For as a seat of study for the best young English life Oxford will always exert a powerful influence upon the thought of the Church, although that influence will be much less direct than heretofore. What we do hope is that the Church will learn to create, strengthen, and depend upon, other resources of her own, more and more, especially for the education of her clergy. Her theological colleges are very humble institutions when we compare them with the splendid foundations on the banks of the Isis and the Cam; but at least they are still hers, and their poverty may, in the days to come, be the guarantee of their safety.

Often have we marked, on a bright day in the summer term, a visitor who has left London by an early train, and who is wandering, guide-book in hand, among the gardens, and quadrangles, and chapels of Oxford, until nightfall bids him return to the smoke and bustle of the great Babylon. He will be there again a few weeks hence. For him the Academic Revolution which we have been describing would have no meaning; since no rude hand has been laid of late, as of old in the seventeenth century, upon the inheritance of beauty which has been bequeathed to Oxford by ages of faith and love; and, here or there, in statue or archway, he may feel that the modern spirit, even while we see it promoting the suppression

of the Christian clergy, is anything but hostile to the traditions of Christian art. To him the genius of Oxford speaks as it spoke to young men thirty or forty years ago: and as he passes from one stately building to another, ignorant of the thoughts and feelings which surge around its walls, the England of the Plantagenets rises, perhaps in ideal and fictitious proportions, before his imagination, and the majestic Church, which from Lambeth or Winchester, Lincoln or Rochester, summoned these great foundations into being, seems to be altogether in possession of the scene. Must we break in upon his reverie and tell him that he is gazing on the fair face of a corpse, from which life has even yet scarcely fled,—slain not by the hand of violence but by a slow process of painless extinction? Is Oxford only to illustrate for him, and on a tragic scale, the failure of earthly efforts to secure even the noblest objects?

O insensata cura de' mortali,
Quanto son difettivi sillogismi
Quei che ti fanno in basso batter l'ali!

Or may we not leave him to his dream, in the confidence that its spirit at any rate is justified by facts; in the confidence that the strong religious faith which raised these walls and sanctuaries is not dead or dying, and that on other scenes perchance, and in other forms, it has already a presentiment of victory? Meanwhile, for ourselves,—

Laudamus veteres, sed nostris utimur annis.

ART. IX.—GEORGE ELIOT.

The Works of George Eliot. 20 vols. (London, 1880.)

COMPARISONS in literature may be most useless, but they may also be most fruitful. It is difficult very often to make clear to ourselves the peculiar manner in which some great writer affects us till a sudden perception of his relation to some other more familiar genius sets his qualities in a true light, brings out their individuality, and illuminates what before was obscure and vague in his influence. If we limit comparison to the function of illustrating and explaining one genius by another, and do not attempt the invidious task of

ranking one above the other, we shall find that it is a most useful means of rightly understanding an author's excellences. This means we would employ in a somewhat audacious manner in the case of the great writer whom we have so lately lost.

To those who are habitually incredulous of the merits of their own generation it will sound worse than absurd to name Shakspeare and George Eliot in the same breath, but nevertheless it is difficult to compare our great novelist with any other English writer so as to bring out her chief characteristics. Some parts of her method, some tricks of her style, can be referred, with more or less certainty, to the influence of contemporary writers. Thackeray, for instance, may very probably be responsible for her perpetual commentary of satirical, sometimes cynical, remarks upon her own characters. Another less obvious source from which she drew may perhaps be found in Balzac ; for in him, with very great differences, we see a similar design of portraying provincial life in its monotonous and tragic intensity, a similar ruthlessness in depicting mean and ignoble characteristics where truth required them, and a similar accumulation of detail, though with him it was the external details of circumstance and setting, with her it was the details of the inner life and conduct. But, after all, these are partial resemblances ; and they are resemblances—let us say it plainly—to men who were not her equals. To find a fitter, because more complete and more adequate, parallel, we must go back to the other great genius whom Warwickshire produced. The comparison is so clearly not exact that it were a waste of time to point out the differences between them ; many of them can be summed up in the one fact that George Eliot was not a poet, though a poetical apprehension of the facts of life forms the medium in which her imagination sometimes works. Our object is rather to trace the resemblances, and they seem to us to be these. George Eliot dealt with human character and conduct in its whole extent ; she saw and recorded facts with unswerving fidelity ; but the shrewdness of her observation was ennobled by her conception of moral principles and of the tragedy of moral conflicts ; she lit up what is sordid and repulsive by a pervading humour, and, above all, she saw and preserved by imaginative power the abiding principles of life amid the shifting accidents of external conditions and historical changes. This combination of qualities she shared with Shakspeare, and with him alone. Without trying to determine how far he possessed them in a greater degree than she did, we cannot refuse to see a simi-

larity between the genius of the man who sketched, as a drama must necessarily only sketch, the decadence of Macbeth, and that of the woman who traced, as a novel is able to trace, the moral ruin of Tito Melema. They have many of the same characteristics with the differing marks of the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries upon them.

We have made this comparison partly in order to illustrate one of the chief characteristics of George Eliot: namely, her love of the past and her power of informing it with the moral life and reality which is gained by a profound knowledge of the problems of the present. Shakspeare, like George Eliot, lived in a time of great change. New arts, new religions, new ideas, were crowding upon the human mind in the sixteenth as they have been in the nineteenth century, and one peculiarity of his genius was that, while depicting the old world before the irruption of the new things which were to transform it, he gave it depth and reality by the thoughts and the problems of his own developed era. What Shakspeare did for mediæval England George Eliot has done for the England of her father's generation. This is an important element in her genius, because it is the result of the two deepest impulses in her nature: namely, sympathy with nearly all human characters, and a determination to seize upon the moral significance of the slightest acts and feelings. Her sympathy is based upon her feeling for the common life of man, the simple natural instincts, the love of home, the love of children and parents, the primary wants which she so often emphasizes. Her own strongest attachment seems to have been to the early scenes of her home life, 'my present past, my root of piety,' as she calls them in her most natural and pathetic poem. Whatever faults human beings may have, however much they may have obscured the brightness of their youth by mature sins, yet they are at least human, they had a home and home love, they still feel wants which are common to all, they still demand our pity and our help by reason of these wants. And so she seems instinctively to turn for rest from the stress and strain of modern conflicts and problems, from the hurry and complexity of modern life, to the slow-moving, simpler life of the past generations. She would like to forget the vexed questions of the day in the sober monotony of the 'times before the Reform Bill,' but it is impossible. The other necessity of her nature is upon her. Simple and slow and monotonous as human lives may sometimes be, yet they are still human, and therefore moral. However far from us in time or in ideas, yet their moral difficulties were in reality

the same as ours; and therefore it is that George Eliot, by virtue of these two strong impulses in her, has been able, more than any other writer, to communicate to us her own sympathy with the past by showing us there the powerful working of the same moral laws as those which make our own lives real to us.

In most great writers it is easy to trace a certain definite change of style, or of thought, or of method, but in George Eliot's works there is some difficulty in doing this. The change in her books does not seem constant or progressive; it is little more than the alteration in subject would naturally produce. It is not like a progress from crudeness through maturity to decay. And this is, perhaps, the true explanation. George Eliot changed little, for her earliest works are already mature. Different subjects produced different treatment, but there is no change in her point of view, in her fundamental principles, no advance from one mode of apprehending life to another, such as, for instance, has been traced in Shakspeare's progress from *Love's Labour's Lost* to the *Tempest*. We do, indeed, see in her, as in Goethe, that gradual stiffening which age brings with it, which in Goethe was shown, as M. Schérer says, in the predominance of a cold and lifeless method of allegorizing in his later works, and in George Eliot took the form of an increased interest in the abstract questions of morality, apart from the characters exemplifying them. But in the main we are justified in saying that in her there is little, if any, real change of thought or of method. In estimating her writings, then, it will be found that any classification of them must cut across the chronological order, because they do not develop regularly, but only change with their subjects. Thus in her earliest work, *Scenes from Clerical Life*, we should separate the third tale, *Fanet's Repentance*, from the others, as being quite of a different order, and akin to *Adam Bede* and *The Mill on the Floss* rather than to the simpler, more external, narratives of the rest of the book or of *Silas Marner*. In *Amos Barton*, *Mr. Gilfil's Love Story*, and *Silas Marner* the main interest seems to be the mere delineation of character and the vivid painting of a bygone era. In *Amos Barton*, more, perhaps, than in any other of her novels, we are struck by one of her peculiar characteristics, the power of drawing out the interest that lies in commonplace, even contemptible, characters, without in the least idealizing them or ascribing to them actions or sayings inconsistent with their real natures. Besides this quality, there is really very little in *Amos Barton* that can be analysed, and yet no one can

deny that it is the work of a master hand. The writer's dramatic humour is shown in the gossip of the old ladies with the doctor, in the admirable clerical meeting (though she fails in the descriptions of the various clergy, which are crude and conventional), and in the slight scene in the workhouse. But the real interest and power of the sketch are concentrated in the person of Amos Barton; and it is not too much to say that no other living writer could have succeeded in combining so much ruthless fidelity of observation and description with such a generous sympathy as she has done in the extraordinary hero of her first tale. All her peculiar method and much of her genius are revealed at once in this sketch. *Mr. Gilfil's Love Story* we cannot place so high as many critics have done. The characters are either slight or unreal, and the story interests us rather by the illustration of old-world manners which it affords than by any merit in the plot or in the telling. It is one of her poetical works; and we are attracted, therefore, by the implied suggestions of beauty in it, by the old-fashioned atmosphere, by the poetical contrast of the young Italian girl with the stately and homely English life, and by the pathetic disclosure at the beginning of the story of the broken and coarsened old man with one lovely ideal in his memory. These are poetical elements, which produce in us vague impressions of beauty; but the story and the characters have always seemed to us inferior to nearly all her other writings. Captain Wybrow is a poor anticipation of Arthur Donnithorne; Tina is unreal and fails to attract our sympathy; Mr. Gilfil is never clearly drawn, except in his lonely old age. We dwell on these failures because every work of this great writer seems to us important, even when it misses its object; for in missing its chief mark it surely gives us many incidental excellences, subtle pieces of humour, a pervading suggestion of sympathetic observation, and continual reference to a past that is full of pathos and tenderness.

In classing *Silas Marner* with these two tales we do so chiefly because, like them, the narrative is direct, and the moral lessons are implied more than prominently brought forward as they are in her larger works. But though this directness and absence of moral discussions may be a mark of her early work, it cannot be said that *Silas Marner* is immature. Few English stories are as perfect: none of George Eliot's books show such a complete fusion of imagination and reflection; present us, that is, with such an artistic whole. This, again, is one of her poetical works, by which we mean that in reading it our emotions are stirred, and our imagination

is quickened, not by the actual facts related, but by the way in which they are told, by the scenery of the story, by the subtle suggestions and associations which accompany the descriptions of the persons and their actions. Poetry has its power not in the direct thoughts or sensations with which it deals, but in the tone and manner, in the incommunicable and indescribable atmosphere of beauty with which it surrounds ideas and images. It is possible to analyse the meaning of poetry, the lessons which the poet wishes to teach, the truths which are given him to declare, but the more real the poetry is the more impossible is it to explain the charm with which the lesson is taught and the truth declared. This charm consists not in rhythm and imagery alone, but, as we have said, in associations, hints, single words or facts, which summon up, as if by magic, a crowd of thoughts and sensations of beauty and pathos. It may be given by a suggested contrast, such as we have noted in *Mr. Gilfil's Love Story*; or, as in *Silas Marner*, by the beautiful fancy that 'the child was come instead of the gold—that the gold had turned into the child.' 'The money is gone I don't know where, and this is come from I don't know where.' This is an essentially poetical way of suggesting the main idea of the book, the idea that the cramping and hardening effect of avarice can be counteracted only by a loving instinct of protection; and it is the way in which the idea is presented that makes the charm of the book. To generalize it, as we have just done, destroys that charm; it becomes at once a formula, the statement of which makes us inclined to doubt and deny it; but embodied in the lifelike characters of Silas and Effie, and clad with the subtle beauty of fancy, it becomes poetry, and gives the character of a poem to the whole book. This character is kept up by the lovely pictures of child-life and the striking contrast between the solitary suspicious weaver and the bright grace of the orphan girl. The poem is an idyll, lacking only melody to take rank with the most beautiful of its class. And the idyllic tone is not destroyed by the obtrusion of abstract moralizing upon the vivid character-drawing and imagery; there is moral reflection in *Silas Marner*, but far more than in her other works it underlies and informs the whole; it does not break in by itself in a somewhat discordant tone, giving us the sensation of speech suddenly intruding upon song, as in most of her books; far less is it the staple of the whole, as in *Daniel Deronda*, but it pervades the story, giving it interest and truth without chilling the life and checking the movement. *Silas Marner* is not George Eliot's greatest, but it is her most per-

fect work ; for she seems to have conceived the subject as a whole, and the picture is therefore consistent with itself, it is in true perspective. This cannot be said of the other creations of her mind, as we shall try to show later.

But though the moral reflection is not obtruded, yet it is there very plainly. It is expressed in the striking character of Godfrey Cass, who is one of the best representatives of her favourite theme, the uselessness of trying to escape from the consequences of our own actions, even the most impulsive, the folly of relying on chance to help us out of difficulties that self-will has brought upon us, the moral degradation incurred by the attempt to shift off the burden of the inevitable results of our own action. Godfrey, Arthur Donnithorne, Tito, Bulstrode, are the various images in which the idea is presented ; and the idea itself we find stated here in one of the few passages of reflection in the book. 'The evil principle deprecated in that religion is the orderly sequence by which the seed brings forth a crop after its kind.'

Both as a story and as a discussion of deep moral problems *Janel's Repentance* is a far greater work than the other tales with which it is included in the *Scenes from Clerical Life*. It is almost an accident that those treat of clerical life more than any other form of old-fashioned country existence ; *Janel's Repentance* is a direct study of the moral effect of one soul upon another in that peculiar relation which is sacerdotal and nothing else. As such its accuracy and value are very great ; if there could have been any real doubt as to the sex of George Eliot, it would have been justified by this study more than anything, for it seems as if nothing but actual experience in clerical life could have supplied the intimate knowledge of the conditions of moral lapse and recovery here shown. It is worthy of notice that George Eliot has depicted representatives of all schools among the clergy, and that her remorseless accuracy, and yet unbounded sympathy, has never failed her in any of them. Whether they are the old-fashioned secular-minded but upright clerics of the Irwine and Gilfil type, represented in its more modern form by Mr. Gascoigne, or the High Anglican of early Tractarian days like Dr. Kenn, or, as in this story, the fervid Evangelical who was the innovator of a previous period, she is able not only to sympathize herself but to put her readers in sympathy with each. Only when she is describing a class, not painting a person, does she caricature and lose sympathy, as in the account in *Adam Bede* of Mr. Ryde, Mr. Irwine's successor.

Janel's Repentance occupies a unique position in George

Eliot's stories. It is the only one in which religion is really the chief interest. The external aspects of religion, and even more, the moral effects of religious belief, were intensely interesting to her mind. We remember hearing it said by one who had the best right to speak on the subject that her interest in any manifestation of the religious sentiment was such that she would willingly sit for hours in a poor little chapel watching Italian peasants praying to a winking Madonna. But her concern in religion seems to have invariably ceased with its effect on conduct. Of any interest in religious truth for its own sake we find no trace except in *Janet's Repentance*. Even that wonderful and pathetic description of the change wrought in Maggie Tulliver by the *Imitation*, which, as we may now believe, was drawn from her own experience, is only a study of its effect on the development of her character; it is the moral result, the lesson of self-sacrifice, that she dwells upon, not the object of belief, or even the growth of religious knowledge in Maggie's mind. In other books the limitation of view is even more marked, and it increased with time. *Daniel Deronda* has no really religious interest at all, for the Jewish faith is denuded of all that made it a religion, and its moral and national influence is alone considered. In *Middlemarch* Dorothea's religious fervour dies away to nothing, and at no time forms an important element in her character. Even in *Romola*, where it was impossible not to include religious faith among the chief forces which were working on society in Savonarola's time, it is curiously obscured by merely ethical interests; it is pushed aside, even in the character of Savonarola himself, by the purely human elements in his nature. And the great change in *Romola's* life is caused, as in Maggie's case, by the raising of a moral rather than a religious ideal before her. To *Romola*, as to Maggie, religion is presented as the force of self-sacrifice, not as the revelation of an overmastering truth before which the soul must bow; and that is a human and a moral force, not supernatural or, in the truest sense of the word, religious.

But in *Janet's Repentance*, though the central idea, like that of *Romola*, is the influence of one soul upon another, and is so far not strictly a religious idea at all, yet we discern a force, a glow of faith, which is lacking elsewhere. Mr. Tryan's influence is not merely moral, and it is to a certain extent detached from himself; it leads, and is intended to lead, Janet on from a restored faith in her own human nature to a faith in One above human nature. 'The act of confiding in human sympathy, the consciousness that a fellow being was listening

to her with patient pity, prepared her soul for that stronger leap by which faith grasps the idea of the Divine sympathy.' In the other stories the religious element is a study of the workings of love and faith; but the faith might have any object, the love might spring from any inward principle. But in *Janet's Repentance* it is most definitely faith in Christ that saves her, and she is led by a thorough love for a fellow creature to love for God. And the result is that in this one story the strict scientific view of human action is given up. We are not bound by the chain of what we have done, if conversion be possible; and Janet's repentance is conversion, while nowhere else in George Eliot's works is its possibility recognized.

Janet's Repentance we would class with *Adam Bede* and *Felix Holt* as being a representation of one great moral crisis in a life, instead of the whole story of a life or a great portion of it, as in *Romola*, *The Mill on the Floss*, and *Daniel Deronda*. And in this group, of course, *Adam Bede* stands out unrivalled. In richness of scenery, in fulness of life, in almost intolerable pathos, and in thorough knowledge of the complex system of obscure motives which precedes any important action, this novel has, we imagine, few equals in fiction. The obvious defects cannot really obscure its immense superiority to most other novels. The end of the story is conventional. The so-called 'sensational' event of Hetty's reprieve is, indeed, sensational only in the telling, for the circumstance itself is natural enough; but Adam's marriage to Dinah is a conventionality which defaces the clear lines of the whole picture and leaves us with a blurred and indistinct vision of the otherwise wonderful figure of the Methodist saint. And the incidental pictures—the Poyser family's walk to church, the birthday festivities, the harvest home—are numerous enough to impede the progress of the story, which they only illustrate instead of developing. George Eliot never became really skilled in the art of narration; Walter Scott and Dickens would have made each scene, apparently introduced for its historical value or for its humour, contribute something beyond mere background or atmosphere to the whole story. Graver defects are to be found in two of the main characters. Adam himself is, as has often been pointed out, somewhat unreal and stagey; the model working man interests us just as little as any other model, and the recollection of the earlier unreality of the character falls like a shadow on the scenes of tremendous pathos at the end. Every good person is so much in danger of being called a prig, and the word is

so much in want of proper definition, that we will not use it here; but we may safely, perhaps, call Adam unreal. But Hetty is real, as real as any human being can be without a soul. The fault seems rather to be that her creator is too hard upon her, and betrays, in a most unusual manner, her want of sympathy with the poor little butterfly being. She betrays it herself, but she does not communicate it to the reader; for we imagine no one has ever ended the book without disappointment at the abrupt dismissal of Hetty from the scene, with no hint that the spiritual and moral consciousness which Dinah brought to life was either further developed or crushed out of her. The unsparing delineation of Hetty's vanity and hard selfishness is, indeed, only one instance of George Eliot's rigorous fidelity to fact; but the careless dismissal and the evident want of interest in the character are peculiar to her treatment of Hetty and of other similar personages in other books. Rosamond and Celia are described in an equally unsympathetic manner, and even with a touch of caricature caused by dwelling exclusively on the unfavourable traits and keeping back or indicating faintly what must have been their redeeming qualities. Hetty has none except her beauty, and in this she exactly resembles Rosamond. Both are wonderful creations, but we are conscious all the time of a certain unfairness in the description, which prevents us from quite sharing the author's feeling about them. In truth, it would seem that the only human character for which George Eliot could feel no sympathy was the pretty, foolish woman who has no sense of others' needs and sorrows, and knows nothing of the greatness of real love. It would seem so, but that in the great creation of her latest story Gwendolen Harleth shows us how such a soul may be quickened and raised from selfish vanity by the force of bitter experience. But for Hetty there is only the slightest hint of such a process; and the want of it is, we repeat, a real blot upon the book.

These are faults, and they are not unimportant. But the two great excellences in *Adam Bede* which would counterbalance many more faults than these are its abounding life and its deep, overpowering moral reality. Contrasting it with almost any other novel, we are struck at once by the fulness and abundance of the life which it describes, so that after reading it the memory is enriched not with one or two real living characters only, but with a whole country side of various human beings, moving freely and naturally about the rural scenes, accompanied by all the happy fresh sounds and

sights of rural life, and each with his own inward drama and picturesque outward fashion. Men and beasts and scenery alike, all are living and glowing with colour, and the few prominent actors stand out against a background which in its loving fidelity and rich accuracy is unequalled among works of fiction. In this, if in nothing else, George Eliot would have shown her true genius; for, like all genius, she has given us more than we expected, more than we can analyse and explain, more probably than she meant to give. In giving us this impression of abounding movement and life her book has passed out of the control of her own purpose, for not only the chief personages, but the whole scene exists and changes in our memories by virtue of its living reality, just as places and people we actually know alter with our moods and change as we look on them because they are real and alive. This we may call the artistic triumph of the book; its practical value consists in the overpowering presentation of the results of ill-doing, the sincerity and reality with which is shown the flimsiness of suggested motives and excuses in the light of the inevitable consequences of action. The moral keynote of the book is given at the very end. 'There's a sort of wrong that never can be made up for;' and the vividness and reality with which this is impressed upon us in the character of Arthur Donnithorne give to *Adam Bede* its immense moral force. It is just these generous pleasant characters that are led to fall lightly into sins that deeply injure others; it is so easy for them to imagine reparation. Few passages in literature are more impressive than the description of Arthur's return home after his grandfather's death; and the impression is made by the feelings of overflowing generosity in his heart, his eagerness to 'do something for' everyone, and especially for Adam and Hetty, 'now it was actually in his power to do a great deal for them,' while we know that there is awaiting him the news of the irreparable results of his past action, the inevitable consequence of sin. To know that 'there's a sort of wrong that can never be made up for,' and that in some degree all wrong is of this sort, is to know one of the deepest lessons of social morality; and it is this knowledge which is burnt into the mind by the awful pathos of *Adam Bede*.

Of *Felix Holt*, which we class with *Adam Bede*, it is not necessary to say much. It illustrates none of the deeper characteristics of George Eliot, except her inexhaustible dramatic humour; it contains no character that is both natural and interesting, except the beautiful sketch of Rufus

Lyon, the Dissenting minister; and therefore the reader's attention is not diverted from the very serious faults in the story itself—the improbable coincidences, the want of harmony between the development of the characters and the circumstances of the story, and the disagreeable nature of the chief incident. These seem to us to account for the comparative failure of the book. She had in writing it a great idea, one of her favourite ideas, the regenerative influence of one human soul on another; just as Mr. Tryan restores Janet, and Daniel Deronda helps Gwendolen to a new life, so she intended Felix to influence Esther. But the characters are not competent to the task of expressing the idea. Felix himself is a failure; and as we never realize his attraction or his power, we have no clue to the change in Esther, which seems to us, therefore, merely external. We believe it because we are told, but no fruitful interest is possible in such a change, and the book can be forgotten with singular ease, because it illustrates and embodies no principle.

In passing to another group of these great novels—the group, namely, of those which deal not with a single crisis in a life, but with the growth or gradual alteration of a whole character—we feel on a higher level as to moral insight. *Romola* and *The Mill on the Floss* are, to our mind, the highest examples of George Eliot's moral teaching, as the latter is the most striking instance of her poetical power. It is, of course, far easier to be true to nature in painting the revolution of character and the conflict of motives produced by one great crisis, than in tracing the slow changes from one spiritual state to another, the gradual formation of will, and motive, and emotion, that we call character. It is this that she has succeeded in accomplishing with such signal success in these two novels. But in other respects the difference between them is immense. In the one the setting of the story, the scenery in which the moral drama takes place, is her own well-loved English home; in the other the distance of time and place just takes from the painting of the background that touch of faithful observation and sympathy which gives to her English scenes the charm of pathos and humour. The necessity of the failure of historical novels to reach the highest, or even a respectably high, level of art cannot be more clearly shown than by the instance of *Romola*. That failure is due to the perpetual effort to reconstruct the past by dint of learning, because imagination utterly fails to give the necessary atmosphere to the story, the numberless minute, probably unconscious, touches which combine to make the main

action real by putting it in a real setting. It may not be impossible, and perhaps in *Esmond* Thackeray has nearly accomplished it; but it would be difficult to prove that any other, even Walter Scott, has really surmounted the obstacle. The difficulty consists not in giving a faithful representation of a bygone time, nor in creating living characters with the speech and costume that are historically due to them, but in combining the two, in making the scenery harmonize with the actors, in avoiding the effect of being in two planes of experience at once, in giving to the surroundings of the story not only interest, but the same interest as the main personages. It is easy to give an historical and antiquarian interest to all the colouring of a tale, but we require something more than this in a work of art; we require, above all, harmony, congruity, perspective. People who have been in Florence, and especially natives of the place, speak with enthusiasm of *Romola*. The fidelity and the local colour and the learning delight them; it is an enchanting guide-book for them, and they find their pleasant impressions and recollections set down and filled out in a manner far beyond them. But look at the book as a work of art, as a creation, and you will be conscious of a discrepancy between the various elements which is fatal to its unity and perfect effect. George Eliot has never, except in *Silas Marner*, altogether avoided this discrepancy; and it may generally be referred to a deeper defect in her works, which will be noticed later; but it is peculiarly apparent in *Romola*. In her English stories the characters and their surroundings are parts of an imaginative whole; they seem never to have existed but in the light and atmosphere, both physical and human, in which they are presented to us. But in *Romola* we are conscious that the two have been pieced together; the moral struggles and falls and conquests of Tito and Romola are present realities and were conceived as such, and then they were deliberately set in an artificial scene which was slowly and carefully prepared and put together to suit the course of the story. To estimate the difference in this respect between *Romola* and the English stories we have only to contrast the stiffness and artificiality of the common gossip of market-place and street in *Romola* with the pervading humour and naturalness of the incomparable tap-room talk in *Silas Marner*, or the introductory village discussions in *Adam Bede*, or the conversation of Mrs. Dollop and her customers in *Middlemarch*. The difference consists in those two all-important qualities, humdur and reality. There is no humour in *Romola*, for George Eliot's humour was the result of observation, not of

an imagination that naturally saw everything through a humorous medium. The minor characters of *Romola* are full of wit, just as the writer's own remarks in all her books are witty; but, like those remarks, they are seldom or never humorous, for they are equally the result of reflection, and humour is hardly ever reflective. This failure in humour is accompanied by a failure in reality and life. The bystanders and spectators in *Romola* have not the distinct individuality of almost every person in *Middlemarch*, or *Adam Bede*, or *The Mill on the Floss*; for they are generally only types—personages constructed by analysis and thought, not human beings created to live by the author's imagination stimulated by her intimate experience of English life. Really creative power never produces types, but persons, who may or may not be afterwards seen to be representatives of a class, being in the first instance directly perceived by the imagination as wholes. This sense of the unreality of the background in *Romola* never leaves us; whether it be Bratti, Goro, and the rest, or the more dignified conclaves at the barber's shop, or the supper in the Rucellai gardens, the lifelessness is equally apparent in all, and it is fatal to the artistic perfection of the book.

In a similar way there is an incongruity between the two main interests in *Romola*. The great, the permanent, achievement is the history of Tito's character, and the contrast between him and *Romola*, with the influence of each upon the other; and this is a modern interest, directly appealing to our modern feelings, and translated into our modern modes of thought. But George Eliot, attracted perhaps by the fascination of the character expressed in those well-known features which were so strangely like her own, wished to bring Savonarola into her story, and the result is a distressing incongruity. Savonarola is historical, and she can never forget it; *Romola* and Tito are creations of her imagination, and when they are brought into contact the difference of tone is only too perceptible. We would not deny that by this book Savonarola is brought nearer to us, and that as a separate study of his life and character it would be invaluable; but when placed with the living creations of Tito, *Romola*, or even Bardo and Tessa, its lifelessness and artificiality are revealed like those of a painted figure on a scene before which living actors are moving.

Nevertheless nothing can destroy the grand and solemn interest of *Romola*. The want of humour has probably caused its comparative failure as a popular novel; but those who look for teaching from great works of imagination, who wish

to know something more of themselves and of other men from the deep and wide observation of great minds, can never forget what a revelation of the possibilities lurking in their own characters the story of Tito was, and what an ideal of noble self-sacrifice the contrasted grandeur of Romola held up to them. We may study many books of maxims, many of the wisest and greatest treatises of abstract morality, but none speaks to us with such force as the few grave words of Romola's counsel: 'Remember, if you were to choose something lower, and make it the rule of your life to seek your own pleasure and escape from what is disagreeable, calamity might come just the same; and it would be calamity falling on a base mind, which is the one form of sorrow that has no balm in it;' for this comes to us embodied in the living forms of the man and woman whom this book taught us to know and see as real beings, striving in the moral conflicts that are ours also.

In *The Mill on the Floss* George Eliot seems to us to have reached the highest point of her artistic and moral achievement. In placing it first in artistic merit we are, we believe, diverging from the common judgment on the book, and we must, therefore, justify our estimate. In purely artistic completeness and symmetry, indeed, *Silas Marner* comes first; but the peculiar distinction of *The Mill on the Floss* is the combination of artistic excellence, not so great as that of *Silas Marner*, but still great, with an unequalled moral loftiness and intensity. The ordinary objections to this novel as a work of art are generally of two kinds; the conclusion, it is said, is incongruous and sensational, and Stephen Guest's character is held to be so vulgar and unworthy as to deprive Maggie's love for him of all excuse, because it checks our sympathy for her, and without the maintenance of our sympathy the artistic unity of the book is destroyed.

Now, of these two objections the first does not seem to be very important. The object of the book is surely to describe not the death of Maggie, but the formation of her character; and therefore the particular mode in which her death is brought about is at most of secondary importance. Our impression of the whole would be very slightly changed were the conclusion far more violent and improbable than it is; for the impression is made by what has gone before, not by the short catastrophe. In all lives death is but an event, and in many a minor event, and perhaps of none could this be more truly said than of Maggie Tulliver. But we will not rest the defence of this incident only on its unimportance;

we maintain that it is not incongruous with the rest. It cannot be decided absolutely that some events harmonize with certain conditions and scenes of life, and not with others; our feelings of harmony are relative to our impressions of the scene, not to the scene in itself. Maggie and Tom, to one who has not read the whole story of their lives, might be described shortly as middle-class English folk in very prosaic conditions of life; but the question is, How has the author described them? If we find that the tone and colouring of the book throughout is such as to prepare us for a strange and inevitable catastrophe, that one of the great forces of nature makes, as it were, a background to the scene, conveying an alien impression into the quiet course of English rural life, we cannot say that the conclusion is violent and improbable, but rather consistent and harmonious. That this is done in *The Mill on the Floss* is, of course, a matter of individual opinion and impression; but in our judgment the catastrophe is duly foreshadowed, and is an artistic completion of the whole. By many slight and scarcely noticed touches the river and its violence in flood time are kept before the mind in a sort of dim underlying consciousness of a force external to all human interests of the narrative, and greater than they. It is this that helps to give the book its poetical character. Like *Silas Marner*, the interest of *The Mill on the Floss* is not to be analysed and logically laid out; it depends in part upon the atmosphere and colouring of the scene, in part upon the dim anticipations of disaster that haunt the earlier years of the story, such as the often-repeated pathetic doubts of the father as to the future of his too brilliant daughter, and the childish quarrels of Tom and Maggie and their reconciliations in face of trouble. In fact, the whole plan of the book is poetical, for the prefiguring of the struggles and sorrows of life in the beautiful years of childhood is an essentially poetical presentation of the prosaic facts with which fiction must deal. In her other novels we have these facts without any soft medium to transform them; in *Silas Marner* and *The Mill on the Floss* characters and events are seen somewhat as familiar objects are softened and beautified by evening light. There are two chief underlying feelings which affect our perception of the events; namely, the associations of the local scenery, of which the great river is the main feature, and the childish indissoluble connexion of brother and sister, which is the foundation of the whole story. It is the union of these two ideas, or rather sentiments, which accompanies the changing fortunes of

Tom and Maggie throughout. The children wander along 'the great Floss with a sense of travel, to see the rushing springtide, the awful Eagre, come up like a hungry monster.' The home scene is accompanied even in Christmas time by the sound and motion of 'the dark river that flowed and moaned like an unresting sorrow.' The deepest feeling in Maggie is expressed by her when she says, 'The first thing I ever remember in my life is standing with Tom by the side of the Floss, while he held my hand. Everything before that is dark to me.' And it is in true harmony, if not in strict logical connexion, with this beginning, and with the course of their joint lives, that they should find their final reconciliation in the waters of the dark river, which had also been the blind means of their final severance. Those who think this end sensational and incongruous have not felt the poetical character of the book, and have missed what to others is its greatest charm.

But Stephen Guest's character is, no doubt, more or less offensive. Still even in this more important point we should be at no loss to justify the artistic merit of the story, were it not for a suspicion we cannot help feeling that George Eliot's perception, or rather taste, was liable to fail her when she depicted young men, and that she did not intend Stephen Guest to appear quite so vulgar and pretentious an Adonis as we must own that he is. Had he stood alone there would be no reason to doubt that she meant to paint a man of merely physical attractiveness, in order to emphasize Maggie's weaker side and account for her fall. But in Ladislav she has drawn a character whom she evidently likes, and wishes her readers to like; and yet we believe that few women and no men can feel any attraction whatsoever in him. Something of the same failure is felt in Tito and in Daniel Deronda; and we should say that it arises from a tendency to dwell too much upon the appearance and small external details of the young men she describes, till they become almost lay figures or posturing puppets. In the most passionate moments of Dorothea's life we are not allowed to overlook the fact that Ladislav was 'shaking his head backward in his old way,' and his hat and gloves are made most inconveniently prominent if we are meant to feel the reality of his nature. So Tito's 'dark curls' are too often pressed upon our notice if we are to sympathize with Romola's love for him; and when we are justifiably irritated by Stephen Guest's 'white hands' and 'well-marked eyebrows,' our irritation is increased by our suspicion that George Eliot did not entirely share it, but wished

us also to be fascinated by this 'long-limbed young man' with the 'diamond ring, attar of roses, and air of nonchalant leisure,' even as poor Maggie was. If not, her object is plain. She shows us in Maggie a nature compounded of keen sensibilities, verging on sensuousness, strong affections, and lofty ideal morality; the tragedy of her life consists in the inevitable conflict between these 'opposing elements,' and while her old home memories and her cultivated spirit of self-denial form the strength of her nobler tendencies there is yet the lower side of her nature, the physical sensibility which could be excited even by an unworthy object. And the more unworthy Stephen is the more clearly do we see that it is the lower side of Maggie's nature which is attracted by him, and the object of the book is to portray the conflict between the lower and the higher impulses. Philip's letter gives the true view. 'I believed that the strong attraction which drew you together proceeded only from one side of your characters, and belonged to that partial, divided action of our nature which makes half the tragedy of the human lot. I have felt the vibration of chords in your nature that I have continually felt the want of in his.'

This, then, is the object of *The Mill on the Floss*: to show how long-repressed passionate impulses may, because they have been unduly repressed, leap out and lay hold of the higher nature and sweep away all original and acquired restraints, and then be conquered, when conquest is hardest, by 'memories, and affections, and longings after perfect goodness.' Those who blame the book for giving a low view of a woman's power of resistance forget what a resistance is described in it; how Maggie resists not, indeed, the first violence of impulse, but the accumulated force of her own action, the sense of the irreparable which is so often the strongest motive for continuance in wrong-doing, and the consciousness of a lurking power of evil in herself which is far harder to conquer than any external temptations. It is this which makes the moral grandeur of the book. The recoil of the passionate nature from the consequences of its own act, the choice of 'the steep and difficult path of a return to the right at the very moment when that return was most of all difficult,' and the obedience only to motives of the noblest and sternest self-sacrifice, have created an ideal surely far higher than any picture of resistance to temptation where the alternative is easy. To Maggie the only alternative was a life of hard, dry wretchedness. And worse than that must have been the uncertainty whether her action would really bring

happiness to others, whether her return would not cause great misery to Lucy and Philip. But the lesson of the book is that 'we can't choose happiness either for ourselves or for another; we can't tell where that will lie. We can only choose whether we will indulge ourselves in the present moment, or whether we will renounce that for the sake of obeying the Divine voice within us, for the sake of being true to all the motives that sanctify our lives.' It seems to us that this is another instance, of a kind even higher than that which is noticed in *Romola*, of the embodying in living figures, and so pressing for ever upon the mind, the loftiest doctrines of abstract morality. Not that Maggie's victory is a reversal of George Eliot's fundamental principle of the 'reign of law' in our lives, for it is rather an illustration of it. The victory is obtained by no new principle in her life, but by the force of her past habits of self-sacrifice and the influence of her deeply-rooted home affections; so that once again it is made true that

'Our deeds still travel with us from afar,
And what we have been makes us what we are.'

The force by which Maggie fell was the force of her own past action, the deceit of her intercourse with Philip, the passionate susceptibility which she had repressed, not conquered; and the force by which she finally triumphed came also from her past action. 'There was at least this fruit from all her years of striving after the highest and best, that her soul, though betrayed, beguiled, ensnared, could never deliberately consent to a choice of the lower.' And so she could say, 'There are memories and affections and longings after perfect goodness that have such a strong hold upon me; they would never quit me for long; they would come back and be pain to me—repentance.' Thus, again, the last and hardest victory is by the same power. 'The light came with the memories that no passion could long quench; the long past came back to her, and with it the fountains of self-renouncing pity and affection, of faithfulness and resolve.'

At the height, then, of George Eliot's moral teaching we meet with the same conception of unvarying law that formed the basis of her physical science. There is no escape from the consequences of our actions; there is nothing but a chain of causes and effects beginning with our own wrong-doing. Now, this is no doubt in the main true, and it is good for us to recognize its truth, but it does not exhaust the facts. Conversion is a fact, as well as habit; but, except in that one story in which she was recalling the feelings of the only form

of Christianity she ever really believed, there is no sign of anything but habit, broken in upon, perhaps, by the unavailing emotions of sorrow and remorse, but in the sphere of action absolutely dominant. Still this has its bright side; the chain of habit need not always bind us to evil, and the truest account of such a conflict and such a victory as Maggie Tulliver's is that it is the conflict of the good we have cultivated with the evil we have cultivated, and the good can triumph.

Of *Middlemarch* it is difficult to speak consistently. The immediate impression it leaves upon the mind is one of failure; it would be so even without the disheartening 'Prelude,' in which George Eliot seems to have concentrated all her vague discontent with our social system. One of the greatest characters in fiction is represented as signally failing in one epoch of her life, and in the other 'her full nature spent itself in channels which had no great name on the earth.' We believe we are speaking for most readers of *Middlemarch* when we say that Dorothea seems to us a wasted ideal, created apparently for the purpose of showing how vain is 'spiritual grandeur ill-matched with the meanness of opportunity,' and that the tone of the whole book is depressed, because its leading character is a woman, and therefore one of those whose 'ardour alternated between a vague ideal and the common yearning of womanhood; so that the one was disapproved as extravagance and the other condemned as a lapse.' And yet we feel, and it is the power of a great genius that makes us feel, what a noble nature is presented to us in Dorothea; we are conscious that though it is 'an imperfect social state' in which she struggled, yet her struggles were those of 'young and noble impulse.' When we are told that 'the effect of her being on those around her was incalculably diffusive,' we do more than accept the writer's word for it; we can imagine it for ourselves; and no novel-reader need be told how rarely it is that we sympathize with a novelist's admiration for his own characters. In Dorothea George Eliot has added one to the number of fictitious characters who help and strengthen us when we think of them; and the greatness of the achievement may be estimated by the smallness of that number. But yet failure is the total impression, and the reason seems to be that the main thought of the book, that which alone binds together its very different elements, is the illusoriness of marriage, or at least its utter uncertainty. It is worth noticing here that of all her books only one, *Felix Holt*, is a conventional study of love before marriage; the others, *Romola*, and *Deronda*, and

Middlemarch, are occupied with married life, and in each of them marriage is represented as illusory. It is impossible for us to come to this subject without having in mind the peculiar circumstances which make it a personal and painful one; it would be possible for us to pass them by in silence were they not well known, and had they not been practically condoned by English society. But we cannot help seeing the close connexion between her books and the facts of her life in this respect, and we cannot help making our protest against both. Of course it will be said her action was consistent with her belief, and therefore not blameworthy, as actions are which are dictated by mere passion in opposition to principle. But surely it is far nobler to maintain beliefs on moral questions in opposition to those of the world and to preach them, if need be, without acting upon them; while working for a change in the moral beliefs of society, to sacrifice personal preference, lest through actions which are misunderstood the standard of morality be lowered. It is nobler, and it is far more likely to attain its object, than a course which cannot fail to be thought at least impulsive and probably self-indulgent. At all events we are justified in saying that the view of marriage which is perpetually put forward in her books is an unworthy one, and in *Middlemarch* it is at its lowest. The relation of Dorothea and Casaubon is not so depressing as that of Lydgate and Rosamond. In the former there is at first an ideal, and afterwards willing, self-sacrifice; in the latter, mere thoughtless fancy, reaping bitter fruits of disillusion. And Dorothea's second marriage does nothing to raise the ideal of marriage. Ladislaw is such a total failure that, whatever may have been the writer's intention, she cannot justify Dorothea, and the verdict of the reader is very much, in the end, that of Mrs. Cadwallader, if not of Sir James Chettam. This is so much the climax of the book that its futility leaves an impression on the whole; it is not counterbalanced by the beautiful picture of Mary Garth and Fred Vincy. The two characters which might give dignity and do give interest to the story, Dorothea and Lydgate, are both wasted, and they are wasted by marriage.

And there are, of course, several serious artistic faults in *Middlemarch*. The three, or four, or five separate plots are scarcely connected even externally, and the writer never surmounts the difficulties of carrying on so many subjects at once. The tendency to unmingled moralizing had been growing upon her, but in *Middlemarch* it is more predominant, and the moralizing is more abstract than in any previous work, and it

does not increase the artistic merit of the story. In fact, her object seems to have been merely to depict character, and therefore it can scarcely be said that there is a story at all. In the one episode which has a beginning, and a middle, and an end, namely, Bulstrode's detection, we are conscious of her invariable inability to manage sensational events, though the character of the man is one of her most striking studies. And yet, when all is said, *Middlemarch* is a great book. The variety of the characters, the consistency of tone, the assured nobility of some of the personages, especially of Dorothea and Caleb Garth, and above all the rich humour of the subordinate characters, make up a total effect which none but George Eliot could have produced. But the real value of the book as a fruitful element in our experience consists in the character of Dorothea, marred though it is by the disheartening failure of her life.

Those who felt that *Middlemarch* showed George Eliot's discontent, and almost despair, found in *Daniel Deronda* a healthier moral tone, more hopeful and more invigorating. At least we have here an ideal to aim at; life is not all failure. If the Jewish cause is not the highest ideal, if it is, as we have said, stripped of all that could make it really a religion, yet still it is a cause, and an inspiring cause. The idea is a noble one, and in some ways it is grandly worked out; but she does not succeed in making it the real interest of the book; for it remains on the whole an abstract idea, in spite of the author's efforts to embody it in the figures of Daniel and Mordecai. The mass of abstract discussion and reflection is far too great; it cannot be quickened by the emotional force or by the artistic beauty of the book. If Daniel were more of a reality than he is, his belief in his nation and his devotion to their service might have life and reality also; but here, as in *Middlemarch* and *Felix Holt*, the failure in the hero makes the central idea of the book a failure. And this affects not only what she intended to be, but that which is, in spite of her, the chief interest. Deronda and the Jews are very lifeless and pallid in comparison with Gwendolen; it is on her character, her struggles, her fall, and her repentance that our attention is really fixed. But Gwendolen is so closely connected with Daniel, his influence is so necessary to explain the development of her character, that failure to realize him takes the keystone from the arch, and reduces the plan of the book to chaos. Nevertheless Gwendolen is one of the most profound studies of character in fiction. George Eliot's knowledge of human nature is nowhere more subtle, more unexpected.

The whole portrait of the brilliant girl whose flimsy knowledge and shallow vanity combine to drag her into a miserable life is absolutely true and original. Such a touch, for instance, as her excuse for killing her sister's canary, which had jarred her with its singing—she inwardly excused herself 'on the ground of a peculiar sensitiveness, which was a mark of her general superiority'—is true not only to nature, but to this particular nature; it is truth not only of observation, but of imagination. To understand the force of the whole conception, compare together the inimitable scene in which Gwendolen consults Klesmer on an artist's vocation and that in which she tells Deronda about Grandcourt's death. The slow bitterness of experience which makes such a change possible is the main interest in *Daniel Deronda*: that is to say, the central figures of the story are Gwendolen and Grandcourt. But Grandcourt, though not to our mind unreal, is only a portrait; he does not change or develop. Gwendolen, on the contrary, is a living creation, and her development is one of the greatest moral studies in George Eliot's writings. The story teaches us the degradation of a self-centred will; how it falls at first under the hated will of another, and then under the yoke of its own past actions; and that recovery is only possible by unselfishness. 'What makes life dreary is the want of motive.' It is the failure to apprehend this that drives women like Gwendolen into any escape from the fancied dreariness of a life that an unselfish motive would gladden and brighten. We may sum up the lesson of *Daniel Deronda* in the words of her own noble poem; it teaches us

'Scorn

For miserable aims that end with self.'

Wordsworth said of Shakspeare that he could not have written an epic, for he would have died of a plethora of thought. He was thinking of the Venus and Adonis when he said this; and the remark comes back to us in reading George Eliot's poems. They are dead of a plethora of thought. A true poet knows instinctively the right proportion between the raw material of poetry and the manufactured product, which is the combination of form and matter. The *Spanish Gypsy* is the raw material of poetry, not a poem. Open it where you will, and you will find thoughts and images enough to make ten poems, but also enough to ruin one. There is no repose in it, and therefore there is no swift progress; we are perpetually turning aside from the object, because the writer wants us to look at something else. Poetry should be

instinctively right and never self-conscious; but George Eliot never loses her self-consciousness, except when it is overpowered by her dramatic feeling. Her humour fails and shrivels into wit when she speaks in her own character; her taste is not sure; she lapses into bathos at times, except when she is guided by her imaginative idea of some living person. If, then, it is true to say of Shakspeare that in an epic his sense of proportion would have failed him, it means that his instinct depended upon his dramatic imagination; for in his plays there is little or no 'plethora of thought.' And in this he resembles George Eliot. But she lacked, further, the poet's indispensable gift, the power of song. What one feels in reading the *Spanish Gypsy* is that it would have been better in prose; there is no music in it. The lyrics halt, and so die out of the memory, except, perhaps, that tiny gem 'Push off the boat.' And the blank verse has no better fate; it is clogged with thought, it dies of self-consciousness. We have not here the real George Eliot, for she lives in her created characters, where she forgets herself, and is guided by the dramatist's instinct to express her deepest moral convictions in the objective forms of living persons. We may, then, leave her poems, certain that we have all that is permanently valuable of her in her novels.

How, then, can we sum up the result of this survey of her writings, the total gain to our literature from her work? It consists, surely, in those two qualities which she has shown in such varied forms—sympathy and moral force. George Eliot was not a perfect writer. Her defects, however, seem to us chiefly artistic, and may mostly, perhaps, be included in the one serious fault of laboriousness. At least her failure to manage her plots is often due to just that habit of over-describing which spoils at times her painting of character. The accumulation of external details checks the narrative, just as it makes us lose sight of the great governing principles of character in men like Ladislav, or Felix Holt, or Deronda. 'Finish' there is to excess; but because of the finish we rarely get impulse and motion. Her stories glide slowly on, and then have to be hurried to an end, with a want of proportion and outline which deprives them of much of their artistic charm. But a more serious, because a more material, defect than this is the want of harmony between her foremost characters and the setting in which they are placed. There are generally two stories at least in her books, and the one is not much affected by the other. One is the narrative of the chief personages, their struggles and their moral difficulties; the other

is the more external painting of the society which surrounds them, its peculiarities and fashions. Maggie and Tom, Romola and Tito, Dorothea and Ladislaw, Adam and Arthur and Hetty, work on each other's lives and affect each other deeply; but we are not shown the effect of society upon them; we are not made to understand the subtle influences which time and place really have upon even the most peculiar characters, because the characters and their conditions are in fact conceived in different ways. Her stories are fixed and unchanging pictures of former society on the one hand, and on the other dramas of individual character, changing and developing by its own actions, and by the actions of a few other leading characters. Only in *Silas Marner* does she seem altogether to have avoided this defect; but only in *Romola* is it so marked as really to destroy the artistic unity of the book. In the others we are conscious indeed that many scenes are introduced rather for the sake of describing the society in which the personages carried on their inward drama than for the influence which that society had upon the personages. The aunts in *The Mill on the Floss*, Mrs. Poyser and Bartle Massey and the others in *Adam Bede*, Mrs. Cadwallader and Sir James Chettam, have their set interludes, but the connexion between them and the real interest of the stories is somewhat artificial. Still we lose this feeling in the enjoyment of the subtle truth and humour of the scenes themselves; only when, as in *Romola*, the setting itself is artificial and lifeless, does the discrepancy become a really serious fault.

But we have to look closely to see this and other defects in George Eliot's work, while the splendid genius is visible in every page. It is her abundant sympathy that makes the characters so real to us; sympathy with the vulgar and insignificant, sympathy with the vile and criminal, keeps her subordinate personages from being mere types, and makes us realize the life that was in them. This inspires her rich humour, for real humour is impossible without a sense of fellowship with the incongruous and imperfect mortals laughed at. So that, perhaps, we should place as her greatest achievement the various studies of commonplace men and women with which her books are full. It is not only in portrait, but in analysis also, that her astonishing knowledge of the obscure movements of mediocre minds is shown. We would instance that wonderful account, in *The Mill on the Floss*, of Mr. Riley's motives for recommending Mr. Stelling as a schoolmaster. Most of us can feel the force of it, for most of

us, like Mr. Riley, are 'more under the influence of small promptings than of far-sighted designs,' but perhaps they had never been made so clear to us before.

It is this sympathy combined with her moral intensity that gives her books their great moral value. For they enable us to judge of men and actions as they ought to be judged; by showing us the complexity of motives, the obscurity of real designs, the rapidity of temptation, we are forced to sympathize with the men who do wrong and foolish things; the point of departure from the normal line of conduct is made so clear, and yet it is shown to be so imperceptible at the time, that we can but feel how easy for us at all times such a departure would be. But then the acts themselves, and their incalculable, inevitable, results are depicted with such terrible insistence and accuracy, that one rises from a novel of George Eliot's with a totally new conviction of the importance of life, and the certainty of judgment. They make us love men more, for they bind closer the human fellowship and force us to realize our common nature; but they make us hate sin more, for they show us our deeds as something apart from ourselves, with an independent life for which we, however, are responsible. That nothing breaks in upon this awful chain of consequence, that the deed once done must live and work for ever, that habits once formed are character, is her philosophy of life. Had she been able to complete it by a philosophy of religion, by a sense of the possibility, rare indeed, and not to be reckoned upon, but still a possibility, of sudden and complete change, the rush of a new and overpowering life into the old captivity of habit, she would have been greater, because truer. We take our stand upon facts when we believe in conversion. But even conversion only changes our own lives; it cannot change what we have done to others, it cannot recall the deeds that have gone from us into the immeasurable sum of causes. So we return to the truth which George Eliot had to deliver, the truth by which she has bound together the varied forms of her experience, and redeemed from the toleration of indifference her universal sympathy:

'Deeds are the pulse of Time, his beating life,
And righteous or unrighteous, being done,
Must throb in after-throbs till Time itself
Be laid in stillness, and the universe
Quiver and breathe upon no mirror more.'

ART. X.—DEAN HOOK'S LIFE.

The Life and Letters of Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., F.R.S.

By his son-in-law, W. R. W. STEPHENS, Prebendary of Chichester, and Rector of Woolbeding. New edition. (London, 1880.)

It is now nearly six years since the quiet country churchyard of Mid-Lavant, standing on 'the breezy slope, descending to a quiet valley, and facing the soft smooth swelling downs,' saw the mortal remains of Walter Farquhar Hook—honoured much as the learned Dean of Chichester, honoured far more as the great Vicar of Leeds—laid by his wife's side in their last peaceful resting place. It is more than two years since Mr. Stephens' excellent biography, which we are glad to see reproduced in a cheap edition for more general circulation, was given to the world. By an unfortunate misadventure it chanced that the book did not receive at once the intended notice in these pages, which was due to its own intrinsic merit, and to the surpassing interest and real greatness of the life which it records. Now, when we desire to repair this purely accidental omission, we are conscious of some difficulty. The book has by this time been very extensively read; all the chief points in the Life itself have been brought out in various reviews; full justice has been done to the admirable manner in which the biographer has discharged his task; and probably thousands to whom the name of Dr. Hook, although familiar as a household word, was still only a name, have learnt to understand more thoroughly what his work really was, and why his memory should be treasured with reverence and affection in the English Church. In some respects, therefore, the reviewer's occupation is gone; and, in endeavouring now to discharge our obligation, we are troubled by an uncomfortable remembrance of the maxim, with which the old Latin grammar familiarized our early days, that *Gratia ab officio, quod mora tardat, abest*.

Perhaps, therefore, it will be better now, not so much to attempt—what in the first instance would have been natural—to draw out from Mr. Stephens' pages a picture of the history of Dr. Hook's life, or to bring before our readers some of those vivid and characteristic specimens of his deeds and words which have already been made tolerably familiar to the public mind; but rather to take advantage of the general knowledge

of these things already gained, by trying to gather up some clear idea of his character as a whole, and of the nature and significance of the work of his life.

But before we do this, we must be allowed to add our tribute of high appreciation of Mr. Stephens' own work. The book is simply admirable as a biography. It bears in every page marks of high literary power, in the art which conceals art, and the scholarly culture which best shows itself in simplicity. But this is its least merit. Far more worthy of praise is the discrimination evident in the selection of materials, from what would seem to have been an overwhelming abundance: a discrimination showing a good critical instinct as to what was likely to be interesting and characteristic, but showing also the still better quality of sound judgment as to what ought and what ought not to be given to the world, according to the higher canons of good taste and right feeling. Most important to our minds of all is the evidence in Mr. Stephens' work of the spirit of warm sympathy and appreciation (free, nevertheless, from the extravagant and indiscriminating eulogy of the *lues Boswelliana*), which perhaps is the first qualification for a good biography, and the resolute self-effacement of the biographer, which is even rarer and hardly less valuable. No man can rightly paint a character or life without sympathy, and yet a picture without shadows, like the traditional portraits of Queen Elizabeth, is a poor representation of the original which it desires to glorify. But even the greatest extravagance of hero-worship is less offensive, and less apt to pervert the truth, than the obtrusion of the writer's own personality into what ought to be a rigidly objective class of work.

Thanks to these high qualifications, Mr. Stephens has produced a thoroughly interesting, and, as it seems to us, a thoroughly truthful book. In its pages Dr. Hook speaks much for himself, in letters which never seek to be brilliant, but which are always vigorous and forcible, often striking, and constantly pervaded by an undercurrent of genial humour. But even where this is not the case, the living image of the man is admirably discovered by a sympathetic but not uncritical insight, and reproduced with no mean descriptive power.

(I.) But we turn from the biography to the character which it depicts. That character, as it seems to us, had a singular oneness and continuity throughout. Like the principles on which it was based, it was formed early, and changed but little in its essential qualities as time went on. Allowing for

the different atmosphere and colouring of youth and age, allowing for the growing control of deliberate principle and firm Christian faith over temperament and exaggerated idiosyncrasy, allowing also for the changes of circumstances and times, which must necessarily affect the development and practical application of forces in themselves unchanged; it appears to us that the character, which grew out so rapidly in his first curacy at Whippingham, was substantially the same which guided the busy work of Leeds and the quieter energy of Chichester. Accordingly it never puzzles us by ambiguities and inconsistencies, nor does it startle us by unexpected developments of elements hitherto altogether dormant, or hidden in conscious or unconscious reserve. As he himself always knew exactly what he meant, and, whether he was right or wrong, was always clear and decided in action and in utterance; so the intelligent reader of his *Life* can hardly fail to carry away an idea of his character, which is at least definite and consistent with itself throughout.

Without wishing to institute any comparison between the two characters, we have often felt inclined to apply to him Tennyson's description of the Duke of Wellington as the

tower of strength,
Which stood four-square to all the winds that blew.

Probably its singular power lay in the remarkable union in it of the intellectual, the practical, the affectionate, and the devotional elements of character.

He would probably have been described, not unjustly, as pre-eminently a great worker, a translator of deep thought and high theology into the vigorous action of everyday life. Certainly it is true that his capacity for work was gigantic, that he never shrank from even the needful drudgeries of life, that to his mind truths and forces represented themselves more in the concrete than the abstract, more in their application to living human actions and actual human needs than in that shadowy and ethereal grandeur, which belongs to the mountain-heights of contemplation. In contradistinction from the great thinkers of the High Church movement, he stood out in the parish, as Bishop Wilberforce stood out in the diocese, as the great worker. He once quaintly declared to a curate, shocked at some theoretical inconsistency subserving a very practical purpose, that he could never have got on 'if he had not been inconsistent'; in other words, he fully understood the difference between systems, theoretically perfect which will not march, and constitutions, growing up

irregularly to meet practical needs, which somehow do march, when on strict philosophical principles they ought to break down. He would have preached as energetically as Carlyle himself the gospel of work; and, by acting on his preaching, he well understood how difficulties, utterly hopeless in theory, have a trick of solving themselves in practice. Possibly he may have cared more to see that the principles on which he acted, were consistent and strong, capable of being understood and applied by the mass of men, and to the emergencies of common life, than to dive down to the ultimate foundations on which truth and life are built. In all this he was eminently a practical man. Nor should we omit, as a striking proof of this practical force, that he thoroughly understood, what many hard workers of a lower grade of power altogether fail to understand, how to set other people to work with him, to inspire them with energy, to give that energy a general direction, and then to leave them free to do the work their own way, to make their own discoveries, and learn by their own mistakes. Mr. Stephens quotes an amusing account of his 'rubbing his hands with delight' when an energetic young fellow-worker came to him with a doleful story of a 'scrape' into which he had got, and declaring with what sounded like unfeeling cheerfulness, 'I am glad to hear it; now you will get on.' Indeed, the extraordinary amount of work, spiritual, charitable, and useful, which a retrospect of his pastorate at Leeds revealed, could never have been done, if he had tried to keep all in his own hands, and had been afraid of stirring up half independent energies on every side.

But while the practical energy was thus strikingly prominent in him, it was kept in its right place by a strong vitality and a steady cultivation of the intellectual element also. His early tastes were distinctly literary. Witness the amusing experiences of his sufferings at Winchester, because he would retire from games, in which his athletic strength (not averse, by the way, in after days to combat) would have stood him in good stead, to a hollow place among the stacks of timber on a wharf, where he might read in peace; steady in his devotion to literature, even (as he pathetically says) 'if I am killed for it, which I think I shall be.' Witness again his quaint idolatry of Shakspeare at Oxford, almost approaching to a 'Sancte Gulielme, ora pro nobis,' when he went to examination fortified with the idolized name as with a phylactery, and his 'intoxication with joy' at the acquisition of Boydell's *Illustrations of Shakspeare*. He de-

clared early in life that his ideal of happiness was a life of study, and his one ambition literary success. When he put aside all other aspirations to devote himself to the work of the ministry, his 'ideal country parsonage' (pp. 30-32) was to contain a 'Parnassus,' the sacred solitude of which was never to be disturbed; and what he thus humorously pictured in fancy he realized in sober prosaic practice. His early days at Whippingham were days of thorough and systematic study, of which a really formidable synopsis is given (see p. 50). Never in his busiest times at Coventry and Leeds did he fail to make leisure for reading, not merely of Scripture and theology, but of 'all that might help to the knowledge of the same.' Of the numberless sermons which he wrote—for he hardly ever preached an old sermon, and thought nothing (as his diary shows) of cancelling one already prepared and rewriting it, if he thought it could be rewritten with advantage—there is not one which does not show real solidity and vigour of thought and bear evidence of past study. Besides, however, all that his sermon-writing implied, he did, even at Leeds, no small amount of literary work. His *Church Dictionary* and *Ecclesiastical Biography*, although undoubtedly, measured by our present standards, they show defects which no one would have acknowledged more readily than he, yet indicate no inconsiderable research and still have a very substantial value. At the time they filled a place, as yet left blank in English theological literature, and even now in many points are not superseded by anything which has since appeared. When, therefore, at Chichester, he plunged with delight into the literary work suggested to him, devoting himself with unwearied energy to the *Lives of the Archbishops*, almost living in his study, except when he was drawn out of it perforce for public duty or daily exercise, rejoicing in those quiet morning hours of reading on which he dwelt with so much zest in one of his latest University sermons, he was not entering on a wholly new phase of life. It was only that what had been at all times an important secondary element was now, by increase of opportunity, expanding to fill a principal place. Hence, as we have already said, he never became a slave to the merely practical temper; which is apt, if left in undisputed sway, to beget shallowness and desultoriness, acquiescence in imperfection and loss of all high ideals, and above all, the mere busyness which fancies itself energy, and wastes its labour for much which, for want of real thought, profits nothing. Hence, also, it was that he was not only able to hold his own

among the hard-headed and most unconventional folk of the West Riding, but to command the attention of politicians and statesmen, and men of literature and science. He always thought things well out, and put them clearly and forcibly; otherwise he could not have done what he did. If thought without work is too transcendental to succeed practically, work without thought is too shallow and prosaic to create enthusiasm and touch human nature deeply. The Vicar of Leeds would never have been so great a worker, if he had not been a solid and patient thinker. The hours in which the light burnt in his study before the world was up, had much to do with the fruitful activity of the busy day which followed.

But there was another side still to his character, which work and thought were never allowed to stunt of its proper development. No one who ever met him will forget the free play in him of affection and humour; no one who knew anything of his inner life could fail to discover the deep simple devotion, and the constant communion with God in Christ, which were the daily sustenance of his spiritual nature.

Every page of his biography shows how singularly warm and strong was the force of affection in him; and, moreover, how thoroughly there were blended in it the intensity of personal affection and the expansiveness of an open-hearted sympathy. He was singularly blessed, both with the blessedness of receiving, and the higher blessedness of giving, in all domestic relations. From his early days, when he poured out his whole heart in home affection, especially to his mother and his brother Robert; through the deep and unvarying love of such a married life as few men ever enjoyed, with one who was indeed a 'woman among ten thousand,' able to strengthen and comfort him, one with him in heart and aspiration, and yet contributing (so to speak) to the unity of their life and work some elements of character, in which he himself was comparatively deficient; up to the fatherly relations of mature life and old age towards children, in whose education love and trust and sympathy played an unusually prominent part—his whole life was cheered and softened and refreshed by a constant play of pure affection, freely developed in the higher atmosphere of the love of God. But not less characteristic was his capacity for that tie of personal friendship, which comes not from community of blood, but from harmony of character. Pre-eminent in this respect is his lifelong friendship with Lord Hatherley, begun at Winchester, cherished through the whole of life, with only a brief interruption in

VOL. XII.—NO. XXIII. T

youth, enforced by parental authority (a specimen of the vehement dissensions which rent English society asunder in the days of the unhappy Queen Caroline), and parted for a time only by the hand of death. 'From December, 1812, or thereabouts' (says Lord Hatherley) 'till October, 1875, when he was taken from us, we scarcely passed a fortnight without either meeting or hearing from each other by letter.' Such friendship as this, of the kind which 'sticketh even closer' than brotherhood, is rare, and indeed impossible, without the existence on both sides of strong capacity of affection, and a free play of individuality of nature under a substantial unity of idea and purpose in life; but where it does exist, it is hard to exaggerate the influence which it exercises to strengthen and develope character. Second, but only second to this, is the relation, obviously something warmer than the relation of mutual admiration and confidence, in which he stood to Mr. Gladstone, disturbed occasionally for a moment by sudden divergence of opinion, such as he expresses (p. 455) so impulsively and vigorously on the Papal Aggression controversy; but at once restored after such brief ebullition, and continuing to the last unbroken. It was unfortunately only too late that the power came to Mr. Gladstone of showing the world what he thought of Dr. Hook, and repairing the long injustice which had refused him due recognition in high places, by pressing on him again and again posts of higher dignity and influence. Among the most interesting letters in the whole volume are those which passed between them in some of the critical periods of his long life.

But these supreme friendships, though they stood out unique in their effect on his life, did not stand alone. There were, and still are many, both of his own and of the younger generation, who found in him such a friend as no one meets with more than once or twice in life, and have reason to thank God for that friendship. Even beyond this circle of intimacy, he showed a singular geniality and power of sympathy, which laid strong hold of the hearts of the people of Leeds, because they were obviously unstudied, the natural impulse of the heart, and not the artificial product of a sense of duty and a desire of influence for good. Not many clergy would have felt with him at Whippingham, that 'to proceed to a village club, and dine with them' gave him 'one of the days he enjoyed most in the whole year.' Not many would have entered as he did *con amore* into the festivities of his Lodge of Odd Fellows at Leeds, where he was accordingly regarded with a most characteristic mixture of rough cor-

diality and unfeigned respect. When he came back from Chichester to visit 'dear old smoky Leeds,' no greeting delighted him more than the exclamation of the ticket collector at the station, 'Why, it's 't'ould Doctor!' and the 'oily fist' of the engineer poked enthusiastically into the carriage. This expansiveness of sympathy is unquestionably a rare gift, most valuable as a source of power over men, but hardly possible without a certain simplicity and self-forgetfulness of character, free from the restless ambition of continual influence and leadership, which, if it often skilfully simulates such sympathy, breaks down sooner or later, and betrays itself as art. No one can rightly estimate Dr. Hook's character without recognizing his unusual power of feeling and inspiring affection. Nor will anyone understand the extraordinary power which he exercised, where men superior in grasp of mind and not inferior in earnestness would have failed, who forgets that the heart counts for at least as much as the head among the commanding influences of the world.

Not unconnected with this element of character was the irrepressible sense of humour, which was in him an hereditary gift. It was allied with a love of fun and good-humoured mischief, which gives him in some of Mrs. Hook's letters the well-deserved title of the 'old boy,' and with that exuberance of high spirits (not unchequered by fits of depression) which seems so often to be given to those who have to bear whether in labour or in sorrow, a more than usual share of the labour of life.

But it was a good deal more than this. Mr. Stephens says:

'His fund of humour was deep and inexhaustible, and came out at every turn and in every imaginable variety of way—in boisterous romps with his children—in letters, in conversation, in impromptu rhymes, and not seldom in his sermons, as well as all his other writings. Sometimes, especially in sermons and letters on grave subjects, his sayings were, properly speaking, more witty than humorous; and generally consisted in placing an opponent in a ridiculous dilemma by some sudden and unexpected turn in the argument. Thus, for instance, when preaching in an Evangelical Church in Liverpool, and defending a reference to the ancient Fathers for assistance in the interpretation of Scripture, he observed:—"We are told that we ought to refer for our divinity to the Bible, and the Bible only. God knows, my brethren, that I wish the Bible were more extensively read than it is, and no one can regret more than I do to find the Bible so generally superseded by tracts." He then pointed out that the treatises of the Fathers were after all only tracts; "so then," he continued, "we are both tract readers: the only difference being that some of us go for these tracts to St. Chrysostom, and St. Basil, and St. Athanasius:

others to a modern Religious Tract Society, no more infallible than the Church of Rome, though the members of both seem to rely on their traditions with undoubting confidence."

'The same cast of wit was manifested in his reply to a proposal made by the ministers of four denominations that he should join with them in the pastoral supervision of the workhouse. He was sorry, he said, that he could not accede to the plan, for although the writer of the letter was pleased to designate him a *generous foe*, he regarded the writer as an *erring brother*. They could not be offended at his refusal, for he understood that they intended to exclude from the arrangement ministers who were not Protestant and Trinitarian. Now he would exclude all who were not Protestant, Trinitarian, and *Episcopalian*. Their principle therefore was the same.'

On the whole, however, there was far more in him of genial breadth of humour, difficult to reproduce in isolated sayings, than of the sharpness and brilliancy of wit so conspicuous in his uncle Theodore. At times, as the readers of the later volumes of his *Archbishops* will remember, it could become caustic in the extreme. But this was by no means its general character; he liked to laugh with people rather than to laugh at them, and mostly succeeded in making them laugh with him. This quality stood him in good stead, especially in his work at Coventry and Leeds; as is seen, for example, in the often quoted story (pp. 224, 225) of his rout of the anti-Church orator at the Church-rate meeting by the 'High Church principle—the very High Church principle,' of forgiving him. But over and above its practical effectiveness, it was a still greater blessing to him, in the very play and refreshment of mind which belongs to it, invaluable in a busy career, which involved a good deal of necessary drudgery, and allying itself not unnaturally with his characteristic freedom of affection, to cheer his daily life. Without both these he would hardly have lived as he does in the hearts of his friends and his people.

But there remains still the highest and most directly spiritual element of character: the devotional element, in which the soul rises to conscious communion with God, in the self-abandonment of faith, the aspiration of hope, and the sacrifice of love. It is the element which a biography can but imperfectly exhibit, without tearing aside the veil from the sacredness of reverent reserve, with a want of right taste and feeling, of which Mr. Stephens would never be guilty. It is, moreover, the element, which careless observers might easily have failed adequately to discern in the perfect freedom and unconventionality of Dr. Hook's ordinary life. He had seen, and recoiled from, the excessive use of emotional

phraseology, and of conventional forms of pious expression, which marked at least the later stages of the Evangelical movement. The 'Saints' of the pronounced type are almost the only class of whom he speaks with bitterness and contempt. Their Calvinistic principles, and their over-familiar and over-unctuous piety, were almost equally his abhorrence. Hence he shrank at all times from anything which looked like what was conventional, morbid, unreal, and thoroughly accepted Dr. Johnson's exhortation to clear mind and talk from any shadow of cant. There is an infinitely amusing description on p. 234 of his attendance at a Methodist Class meeting, and his direction thereof, especially in relation to an unhappy man, who began 'to set up his Ebenezer,' and pour out spiritual experiences, derived from 't' Vicar's sermon t' other night,' with what 'the unmerciful Vicar' thought to be a self-deceiving hypocrisy.

But nothing could have been in reality deeper, simpler, or more fervent, than the devotional side of his Christian life. How entirely this was sustained by the help and sympathy of his incomparable wife, all will know who have read her *Meditations for every Day of the Year* and *The Cross of Christ*, which, most characteristically, she insisted on publishing anonymously under the editorship of her husband. It underlay the whole of his active, thoughtful, genial life; it showed itself in the substance of every sermon, and even in the tone of voice, in which he spoke of the inner spiritual life and its relation to the Personal Saviour; it emerges again and again in his letters, wherever unrestrained sympathy allows the unlocking of the secret chamber of the soul. There was (at least as far as men knew) little of excitement and ecstasy in it, no touch whatever of dreaminess or mysticism. But being by nature liable to the depression which belongs to all humorous and impulsive natures, and to fits of almost morbid self-depreciation, he brought his griefs simply and earnestly before God, just as he laid before Him his thoughts and doubts, his hopes and fears at any critical time of life, and always found there the rest and peace which the world cannot give. There is something especially touching in the last two letters given by Mr. Stephens, written very shortly before his death.

'To Lord Hatherley—The coming End.

'August 5, 1875.

'I have been wonderfully struck by what you told me, of Professor Airy's remark, that the wonders of Providence are to be seen in the microscope rather than in the telescope. When you find the Divine

Providence coming down to the minutest of things, you see at once that insignificant as you may be, you cannot be passed over. These thoughts crowd upon the mind, as the end draws nigh, and oh ! my friend, what should we do without a Divine Saviour. As one groans over the past, one looks with hope into the future, and yet one feels that, love Him as we may, we do not love Him as we ought to do. Pray for me, as I for you.'

'To Mrs.—, on the Death of her Husband.

'October 6, 1875.¹

'For your kind, affectionate, and pious letter I return you my most cordial thanks.

'For your dear husband I entertained respect, as well as affection, and I am thankful that I was instrumental in giving you some years of happiness.

'I am old, seventy-eight, and very infirm. My contemporaries are passing away, and I expect soon to receive my summons.

'Pray for me.'

But the same element ran through his whole life and character, dominant even when unseen, harmonizing all the other elements in the deep sense of communion with God in Christ, alike in private devotion, the worship of the Sanctuary, and the Holy Communion of the altar itself.

Such is the character which these pages so well depict ; certainly a character in which all the elements of human nature were well represented, and which had its points of contact with various natures and phases of life. But it must not be supposed that his was either a calm, evenly-balanced character, or one deliberately versatile and many-sided. If it had been, he never would have done the work he actually did ; for these characters are not those which conquer the world, even if they are fit to organize conquests already won. On the contrary, his nature was certainly an intense and impulsive nature. He says in one of his letters, 'I would rather ten thousand times be in a scrape with the good-hearted than on the highest pinnacle with the merely right-headed. Besides, I am quite certain that we more often do right by yielding to the impulses of the heart than by listening to the cold calculations of the head.' This was his principle through life. Professor Max Müller describes, in his *Essays on Religion*, that form of half Polytheism, which he calls Henotheism, in which, out of many gods acknowledged the one worshipped at the moment is made all in all, the representative of the whole of Deity. Whatever we may think of this as a theory of religion, we must hold that something like this is the condition of

¹ Written a fortnight before he died.

effective work. We may do many things, but we must do each, if it is worth doing, with our whole might, as a good general throws the strength of his force at any moment on the one critical point. Certainly Dr. Hook could do this; whatever he took up—action, study, affection, devotion—he threw his whole nature into it, for the time, without reserve. Of course, he made many mistakes. As his judgment of men was rather intuitive than critical, 'being (as he says) slow to suspect anyone, though rather inclined to be violent when I detect a rogue,' he was sometimes taken in. Indeed, these things would have happened to him far oftener if Mrs. Hook had not been at his side to supply the defect. But he learnt by his mistakes, and succeeded in spite of them. Even his impulsive temper—a 'diabolical temper' he somewhere calls it—though it led him to occasional injustice, generally acknowledged and atoned for most generously, yet being on the whole kept under stern control, occasionally supplied just the impulse of quick indignation and vehement eagerness, which can do at times what strong unimpassioned pressure will not do. Nor did he ever lose his identity of character in all his various phases of activity. Mr. Stephens says with perfect truth—

'It is indeed in the *variety* of his powers, as well as in the force of character stamped upon all he said and did, that his chief claim lies to be considered an *extraordinary* man. He was at once an active pastor, an eloquent preacher, a laborious student, a voluminous letter-writer, an able historian, a witty humorist, a wise practical moralist, an earnest Christian, an ardent patriot, and, every inch of him, a sturdy Englishman.'

But whatever he did was always characteristic: however he might feel and act with others, however he might find himself a place in various fields of energy, he was always very emphatically himself.

(II.) This consideration of the chief features of his character leads on naturally to an estimate of the particular work which, with these qualifications, he was called to do. We may look at this work under two aspects, in relation to the part which he played in the great Church Revival of this century, and in respect of his own personal influence in his various spheres of labour.

In principle it is hardly necessary to say that Dr. Hook was the stoutest of Anglicans, or Anglo-Catholics, for in those days it had not become the fashion to distinguish the two. In Dr. Newman's *Apologia* three principles are marked out as

essentially characteristic of the Oxford movement begun in 1833, in antagonism not to the Evangelical movement, but to the Liberalism, which that movement was unable to meet. First, the 'principle of dogma,' the recognition of the absolute truth and the historical basis of Christianity. Next, the assertion of the vitality and continuity of the Visible Church, preserving amidst all corruptions and declensions the Apostolic mission and the reality of the Sacraments, as the secret of its corporate life. Thirdly, strong protest against the claims of the Church of Rome, occasionally going so far as to brand them as distinctly anti-Christian, and taking up against them the old Cyprianic ground of the rights of the Episcopate, and the independence of National Churches.¹ These principles, which afterwards ceased to content some of their first assertors in *The Tracts for the Times*, Dr. Hook adopted from the first, rather as a sympathizer than a disciple of the Tractarian School properly so called, and never departed from them. In the *Via Media* of Anglicanism—then the watchword of the High Church party, now apt to be despised or defended by bated breath—he was ready at all times to glory. Not that, as is sometimes ignorantly supposed, he, or those who thought with him, defended it simply as a middle way, defined by a constant balance between opposite extremes. They did not hold it to be *vera quia media*, but to be *media quia vera*, as preserving the Catholic and Primitive Truth, from which, as a matter of historic fact, opposite errors had diverged in the Roman and the Puritan direction; and accordingly they declared it to have been ascertained and taken up, not by a precarious balance of continual compromise, but by a simple consideration of the truth itself, as declared in Scripture, and taught from Scripture by the authoritative interpretation of the Primitive Church. Nor, again, must it be supposed that they were contented with the isolated position of the Anglican Communion, in relation to the other portions of the Western Church, or forgetful of the offer of submission to a General Council put forth by the old Anglican divines. But they laid the blame of the breach of unity on the usurpations of Rome, stoutly denied her claim of jurisdiction, classed the Roman Communion in England as schismatic with the other forms of Non-conformity, and quietly took up an attitude of sturdy independence, waiting and hoping for some truly Catholic reunion of Christendom in the hereafter. As he himself says: ²—

¹ See Newman's *Apologia*, edition of 1879, pp. 48-53.

² See p. 313.

'The great desire of High Churchmen is, to promote union and correspondence between the different members of the Church Catholic; to induce our Catholic brethren on the Continent to renounce their peculiarities which unhappily separate them from us, while we keep ourselves free from the peculiarities of Protestant sects, and exhibit to them the English Church as she ought to be, and would be, if those who serve her altars were only honest to their vows, and would obey her laws.'

At that time he and others cherished the hope shared by some thoughtful continental observers that the Anglican Communion might be, under God's blessing, the link between the Eastern and Western Churches, and supply the leaven which should work for a true and non-revolutionary reformation of the whole Church.

But Dr. Hook took up, perhaps, more of a distinctly Protestant attitude than many of those who otherwise felt with him. On the one hand, while his letters show that he was no idolater of Establishment, but prepared to allow that its advantages, great as they are, might be bought too dearly; while the bold declarations of the celebrated sermon 'Hear the Church' showed how far he was from any touch of Erastianism; while his *History of the Archbishops* published to the world what he invariably held as to the despotic and Erastian usurpations which mingled in the English reformation of the sixteenth century; yet, perhaps, more than many of the leaders of thought at Oxford, he sympathized, as a thorough Englishman (who rather gloried in some English prejudices), with the strong feeling for national independence against foreign dominion, which runs through English Church history long before the sixteenth century. Again, on the great principle of 'Justification by Faith,' though at all times vehement against Antinomianism and 'Justification by Feelings,' he was more inclined to accept the declarations of our Eleventh Article without reserve, and to enforce them as bearing closely on vital Christianity, than some other divines of the High Church school. He preached the doctrine itself prominently and earnestly, and saw very clearly the individuality of personal religion which it embodies. He had, therefore, as little notion of being ashamed of the title 'Protestant' as of making this purely negative and secondary epithet a substitute for 'Catholic.' The reality of the mission of the English Church to the English-speaking people, her right of protest and reformation as distinct from revelation, the sacredness of her unity as against schism, the truth of her doctrinal position as against Protestant heresies and Romish innovations; these

were the points on which he made up his mind from the beginning, which he proclaimed with continual earnestness, and from which he never swerved.

There were, therefore, naturally enough, some remarkable occasions on which these feelings led to divergence on his part from the line taken by the avowed disciples of the Oxford school. So it was, for example, in the experiment of the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric of Jerusalem: an experiment which has proved barren enough, but which might have had far-reaching results for good and for evil. So it was in the storm of indignation created by the 'Papal aggression,' with which he thoroughly sympathized, and for once denounced even Mr. Gladstone for standing up against it. When, again, he joined in 1849 in resisting the hasty and partisan condemnation of Mr. Ward, and the attempt to extend that condemnation to *Tract XC.*, it was rather from the same hatred of one-sided narrowness and persecution, which led him at one time to do public honour to Dr. Pusey when he was under proscription, and at another even to sympathize with Mr. Maurice, when an attempt was made to exclude him from the Vere Street Chapel, than from any strong sympathy with the views put forward by those whom it was desired to condemn. When subsequently the 'Gorham Judgment' shook the confidence of many of the High Church school in the Church of England, and drove such men as Manning and Robert Wilberforce to Rome, Dr. Hook, though he stood up as firmly as anyone for the true doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, yet declined to see in the judgment a proof of Anglican apostasy, and still more energetically protested against flying from it to the far greater derelictions from Catholic truth involved in the Roman system. But, above all, it was through this strong feeling against all appearance of Romanizing tendencies that he was almost from the beginning so entirely out of harmony with the S. Saviour's clergy, that neither he nor they could possibly do full justice to one another. The whole of the history of S. Saviour's Church was, as Mr. Stephens truly says, the one bitter episode of his career at Leeds. Standing on his unchanged position, he was assailed on either hand. Declaring himself at once 'Catholic and Protestant,' he found, as the fray grew fiercer, that the first title was denied him by the one side, and the second by the other. In return he fought manfully and smote fiercely enough; and like most who occupy a middle position, found himself more energetically denounced by each party than even its extreme antagonists. Still he held his own, and in a letter to the *Guardian* in

1850 maintained his position with his usual plain-spoken energy :—

‘I am not conscious of having changed a single principle during the last thirty years ; but, on the contrary, I am only more confirmed in my admiration of the principles of the English Reformation, and more persuaded that the Church of England “is the purest and best reformed Church in Christendom.” For asserting this I have been called a High Churchman, and I assert it still. As far as the Church of England goes, I will go, but not a step farther. Neither will I intentionally come short of her requirements.

‘I have not left any old party, and certainly I have not united myself to any new party. I am where I was found by many of those who are now severe in their censures of me, and where I intend by God’s grace to remain When I now find them calumniators of the Church of England, and vindicators of the Church of Rome ; palliating the vices of the Romish system, and magnifying the deficiencies of the Church of England ; sneering at everything Anglican, and admiring everything Romish ; students of the breviary and missal, disciples of the schoolmen, converts to mediævalism, insinuating Romish sentiments, circulating and republishing Romish works ; introducing Romish practices in their private, and infusing a Romish tone into their public, devotions ; introducing the Romish confessional, enjoining Romish penances, adopting Romish prostrations, recommending Romish litanies ; muttering the Romish Shibboleth, and rejoicing in the cant of Romish fanaticism, assuming sometimes the garb of the Romish priesthood, and venerating without imitating their celibacy ; defending Romish miracles, and receiving as true the lying legends of Rome ; almost adoring Romish saints, and complaining that we have had no saints in England since we purified our Church ; explaining away the idolatry, and pining for the Mariolatry of the Church of Rome ; vituperating the English Reformation, and receiving for the truth the false doctrines of the Council of Trent ; when I find them whispering in the ears of credulous ignorance, in high places as well as in low, that the two Churches are in principle the same ; when they who were once in the pit on the one side of the wall have now tumbled over on the other side, and have fallen into “a lower deep still gaping to devour them” ; I conceive that I am bound as a High Churchman to remain stationary, and not to follow them in their downfalling. I believe it to be incumbent upon every High Churchman to declare plainly that it is not merely in detail, that it is not merely in the application of our principles, but in our principles themselves, that we differ from the Church of Rome ; and that no man can secede to Rome, the system of which is opposed to the truth as it is in Jesus, without placing his soul in peril, and risking his salvation’

Now, it is, of course, plain that this maintenance of the purely Anglican position is far from even professing to solve the general religious problem of modern Christendom. There

is necessarily a certain narrowness of insularity about it. Although by the marvellous extension of the English-speaking race and the Anglican communion it has in some sense to contemplate a world-wide development of energy ; yet, except on the visionary supposition that the Anglican type is capable of such development as to embrace all religious communities, we cannot gather from it any large conceptions of the means of regeneration and reunion of Christendom. Those, therefore, who have now to look upon the wider field, in which Christian truth is battling in various nations with Secularism and Infidelity, and Christian unity striving to maintain itself against the indefinite disintegrations of sectarianism, may naturally feel a longing for some larger and deeper principles, and chafe against simple Anglicanism as too narrow and timid in its whole idea. They may perhaps charge it with a pedantic inclination to apply to the Church at large peculiarities of system, which have grown up in England, simply because they have been swayed by the course of English history, and have been adapted to English character. They may think its thoroughgoing advocates too apt to blind themselves to the existence of dangers and drawbacks, which have resulted from close connexion with State authority, and to the seriousness of the acknowledged defects in its power over the masses, even in England itself. To these objections probably Dr. Hook and the men of his school would have replied that they did not profess to offer any solution of the general problem at all ; that they were content simply to hold and defend a position, which had devolved historically on the Church of England ; that, by doing this immediate duty, they hoped to prepare for the greater questions of the future, and meanwhile were content to wait ; that on the basis of this ecclesiastical independence they were ready to fraternize on terms of free federation with all Churches holding to a true Catholic system ; and that those who, in search of unity and infallibility, were willing to unite with Rome, on the only possible terms of absolute submission, were throwing away a real and tangible substance for what was after all a grand and visionary shadow. We cannot doubt that the answer has much force ; and when, looking back over the last half century, we see what those who made it have actually done for the Church and her influence, we may perhaps be prepared to listen to their advice to hold fast what we have, amending and defining our true position, and waiting not impatiently until the time for some larger and more daring policy shall safely come.

But while Dr. Hook thus claims a prominent place in the Anglican school of thought—with a stronger personality, a bolder vigour of practical genius, a more perfect freedom from ecclesiastical pedantry, and a greater sense of humour and power of enthusiasm than are found in many representatives of this school—and while accordingly he must have had considerable influence on the general thought and action of the Church of this century, yet it may well be doubted whether the greatest work of his life was not that which he did in the various spheres of his own ministerial labour. Beyond all else he was a parish priest. It has been said with a good deal of truth, that what Bishop Wilberforce's career was as a new point of departure for the English Episcopate, that Dr. Hook's work at Leeds was in relation to the parochial system. But this was not so much by the introduction of any new ideas or new principles of administration, as by the recognition of a higher standard of duty and opportunity, and the impress upon it of a strong living personality, kindling men's minds by the inspiration of a great example. His own characteristic saying at a Church Congress, on occasion of a discussion on the management of a parish, 'I did not manage the parish; the parish managed me,' was not more humorous than true. He did not make the parish a field for working out great theories of his own; the mere faculty of administration was probably not so great in him as in some of his fellow-workers. He generally allowed the pressure of necessity and the natural growth of spiritual activity to suggest the machinery necessary for parochial work; he delighted to see the energy of the Churchmen of Leeds develop itself with a good deal of variety and freedom; and was often wisely inclined to create a sense of spiritual necessity and an appetite for spiritual food, and then leave those who felt them to take the initiative, so far, at least, as to come to the Vicar for guidance and authority. The result was that the development of the Church in Leeds, from a condition of decadence and almost deadness, in which spiritual leadership and vitality were avowedly sought for in other religious bodies, to a power probably unexampled in any great manufacturing town, was a natural growth, not an artificial product. It did not collapse when his hand was removed; it has lived on under his successors with some variety of development, but with a real continuity of life to the present moment.

The secret of his remarkable pastoral power lay, first, in a deep sense of the reality of the mission of the Church, and of

himself as her minister. At first he had to stamp that conviction on the minds of a community accustomed to look on the Church as only one of many 'denominations'—first in dignity, but not necessarily in power—by a resolute assertion of her sovereign claims, which some called intolerant, and others pronounced to be excessive in prominence. At one time it was said jokingly that of the proverbial 'three parts' into which sermons are apt to fall, whatever might be the subject of the first and second, the third was always devoted by him to 'the Apostolic succession in the Church of England.' However willingly he might work with Nonconformists in social or philanthropic activities, on religious matters he declined all co-operation which might imply equality or quasi-equality of claims. This line he took most resolutely, in spite of many denunciations of foes and some remonstrances of friends. As time went on, and the position of the Church in Leeds was more firmly established, he could afford to dispense with the instancy in season and out of season with which he had at first felt it his duty to assert it. It is notable and instructive enough that when, on his departure from Leeds, the town at large united in a testimonial to him, none were more enthusiastic in the cause than some of the chief Dissenting leaders. They acknowledged the religious leadership of the Church as an accomplished fact: they knew that it had been victoriously asserted, in a spirit, not of vain-glory, but of responsibility; and they could not be blind to the extraordinary impulse which had thus been given to the higher life of the whole community. Few points in the history are more interesting than the gradual victory gained over the jealousy of Dissent in the persons of the churchwardens of the parish church, at first (curiously enough) through the sympathy of Chartist working men with a true friend of the people, and then by the reviving strength of avowed Churchmanship.

This confidence in his mission was supported, next, by an all but unbounded devotion on the Vicar's own part to personal labour and sacrifice. From the first he set up by example a high standard, up to which his fellow-workers naturally grew. The erection of the new parish church on a scale of what was then unexampled costliness and grandeur; the establishment there of a musical service of extraordinary perfection and beauty; the collection of immense sums for all purposes of good, parochial and general, beneficent and spiritual; the erection, during his pastorate, of churches, schools, parsonages in every part of Leeds,

making up in one generation for neglect of many generations past; all were in large degrees the result of this inspiring example. In the multiplication of services, the constant sermons and catechizings, the frequent celebrations of the Holy Communion—to say nothing of pastoral visitations, superintendence of schools and charities, and the like—the Vicar took the full share, and more than the full share, which belonged to his proper leadership. His power of work was no doubt extraordinary: possibly he may have at times done too much, and certain it is that occasionally even his energies were overtaxed. But the perfect simplicity with which the work was done, as a matter of course, and everything else sacrificed to it, was probably one chief secret of its effectiveness, and was certainly the power which mainly called out the sympathy and imitation of Churchmen at large. It was this that he especially desired. The great point was that the work should be done: it was a very secondary question who should do it. Thus it was characteristic of his confidence in the parochial system—overcoming the natural delight of a strong character in retaining the general direction of the spiritual activity of the whole Church community—that in the famous Leeds Vicarage Act he laboured to divest himself of power as well as revenue, and took pains to overcome all legal hindrances and legal safeguards of the parochial privilege of the Mother Church, in order to set up in the great town of Leeds a number of independent centres of spiritual work and influence. His faithfulness to right principle had its reward. In some cases, perhaps, the Act may have failed; for there is a limit to the advisability of parochial subdivision. But the general result has been of infinite value. Since Dr. Hook's death, the principle has borne new fruit in the new Leeds Church Extension movement; and it remains as a standing witness of the self-sacrifice of his pastoral work.

If, again, we look to the method of the work, thus confidently and earnestly taken up, we notice that on the one hand it aimed at dealing with the whole of human nature and human life, and yet on the other resolutely subordinated all other phases of activity to the distinctively spiritual work.

He considered that as vicar he was the minister, the servant for Christ's sake, of the whole community. There was nothing which could promote the general welfare of the town, especially of the working classes, in which he did not assume at once his proper place of labour and influence. We

see how large an interest he took in the charitable institutions of the town, and in all special philanthropic movements, which necessity called on from time to time. The various educational institutes, the Philosophical Institution for the upper classes, the Mechanics' Institute for the tradesmen and higher mechanics, the working men's clubs and recreation societies—to say nothing of the Church Institute, formed in the latter years of his life at Leeds—all in various ways he strove to help, often by lectures and addresses, oftener still by his presence and encouragement. He himself became a member of one of the lodges of the Oddfellows, and considered it one of the highest honours of his life that twenty thousand members of the Friendly Societies requested him to sign their address to the Queen on her visit to Leeds, and present it on their behalf. 'His real strength,' it was remarked, 'was with the working classes.' Unquestionably he won his influence by no flattery: but his sympathy with them was too real and simple to be mistaken, as he showed in respect of the Factory Bill, the Early Closing and Temperance movements, and occasional strikes and conflicts between labour and capital. Whatever could tell upon human nature for good, he considered to belong to the minister of Him, who was the true Son of Man. In education, perhaps, he took most interest of all. His well-known scheme of popular education, advocating the separation of secular and religious education, laying the former on the State, and the latter on the Church and the other religious bodies, was, we think, very justly attacked and happily rejected, because it separated in theory what cannot be separated in practice, and committed the main training of children to teachers bound to a secular system, forced to hold a non-religious, which must become an irreligious, position. Yet its strongest opponents allowed that it was dictated by a genuine enthusiasm for the education of the people, a recognition of the rights of religious liberty, and a firm conviction that a religious education, in order to be thorough, must be definite, and what men call 'denominational.' In these points, urged strongly in 1849, he was certainly far before his age: although we cannot agree with his biographer in regretting that his scheme was not carried out, and we think that he himself must have felt some qualms about it, when it was welcomed enthusiastically by the ultra-liberal Bishop (Stanley) of Norwich.

While, however, his idea of pastoral work was thus comprehensive, claiming for the ministry of the Church much of what is commonly called secular, it is obvious that he never

allowed the distinctly religious function to be for one moment dethroned from its right supremacy. The parish church was the centre of the whole work. The word of God preached day by day, earnestly, thoughtfully, thoroughly, was to him the one great source of all true light. No man more valued the ordinance of preaching as a divine ordinance; no man more entirely threw his whole soul into it, or devoted to it more conscientiously the very best of his labour and thought. It is remarkable that he seldom preached without book; although he could and did speak *extempore* with no inconsiderable effect. But certainly his experience shows the falsity of the now prevalent belief, that written sermons cannot speak from heart to heart, and cannot stir the masses of the people. Yet the whole conception of the parish church system set forth with at least equal clearness the ministry of grace. On the doctrine of the Sacraments, while strongly opposed not only to Transubstantiation but to kindred theories of a carnal type, he was at all times most emphatic, both in preaching and in practice. The belief in the grace of Ordination, and in the consequent power of the keys, was to him at all times the one ground on which his work and his claim of authority were based. The glory of worship as an essential part of the corporate life of the Church, and the secret of the Communion of Saints with God in Christ, was set forth to mind and ear and eye at every point with the greatest possible thoroughness. Wherever else he might work for Leeds, the Church was his true home and stronghold; whatever other forces he might bring to bear on the people, the light and the grace of God were made the one thing needful. Nor did he lay less stress on the personal relation of the pastor to the members of his flock. He considered it one of the happiest parts of his own training that he had begun life in a small country parish, where this personal relation was most completely brought out.

‘As he always looked back to Whippingham with gratitude for the leisure which it had afforded him to lay deep the foundation of his theological and historical learning, so also did he regard his residence there as the period in which, more than in any other, he had acquired the pastoral tone of his mind and formed the pastoral habits of his life. When he was not in his study he was constantly engaged in visiting his people, and the parish, though extensive, was not so large as to prevent his becoming in this way the intimate friend of every member of his flock. His power of sympathy, the most indispensable qualification of a successful pastor, was in this manner continually being drawn out and strengthened, and became then and ever afterwards a principal, if not *the* principal, source of his

VOL. XII.—NO. XXIII.

U

extraordinary influence over the hearts of those amongst whom he ministered. It was his belief that the larger scale on which work has to be carried on in towns, the multiplicity of business in which town clergy are involved, and the consequent distraction of their energy and sympathy into a variety of channels, rendered a town parish an unfavourable school for learning the duties of the pastoral vocation. "I say without hesitation," he writes, long after he had become Vicar of Leeds, "that the very worst training a man can have is that which he receives if appointed early in life to a town parish. The strong pastoral feeling is generated in the country, and I attribute what little success I have had entirely to my country breeding."

But what he had learnt there, he never allowed to flag even in the whirl of Leeds life. He was, indeed, opposed most resolutely to the system which makes private confession and spiritual direction the normal condition of Christian life. Yet, like every true parish priest, he had many penitents, who owed to him under God their conversion and spiritual guidance; he was often applied to for spiritual counsel, and never in vain. But, beyond this, pastoral visitation in all ranks, especially to the sick and sorrowful, was to him not more a duty than a delight, and his earnest Christian sympathy made him a true comforter. He tells with delight in one of his letters how a poor old woman was overheard saying, 'I like to see t' vicar when I be ill; he talks so like an old woman.' In spite of the pressure of work of that more general kind which comes on the vicar of a great parish, who is at the same time the leading influence in a great town, he never would relinquish this personal dealing with souls. There are two opposite errors in pastoral work: the narrowness, which forgets the man in the priest, and the laxity, which sinks in the work of humanity the mission and the priesthood of God. Dr. Hook's great power lay in the avoidance of both.

These were the chief characteristics of his work as a parish priest. Everyone must feel how great an injustice was done in the deliberate refusal to him of higher posts of dignity and power in the Church. But whatever he might have been as a bishop, it is doubtful whether he would have been greater, or have done greater service, than he actually did in what seems to the world a lower sphere. The presbyterate, after all, is the true backbone of the ministry of the Church; as he himself urged in his one anonymous work, *The Rights of Presbyters asserted*. To have aided, as he so powerfully did aid, in raising the standard of the influence and duty of the parish priest in our great towns is perhaps as great a work as could be done for our generation.

(III.) We make no apology for having dwelt especially on this part of his career. Without undervaluing the able and valuable service which he did at Chichester, it is impossible not to feel that the great work of his life was done when he left Leeds in 1859. The comparative rest of the last sixteen years of his life was broken by the fall of the Cathedral spire, and all the labour of restoration which it entailed; and it gave occasion for *The Lives of the Archbishops*, in itself a work of great permanent value, and a singularly remarkable work, as coming at the close of a long life from one who had not been a professed student of history. But still it was comparative rest; and, with some few regrets for 'dear old Leeds,' he accepted it naturally and gladly, as a quiet close of this life and preparation for the next.

In 1871, his wife, who in the course of nature should have survived him for years, went to her rest before him. What she was in herself, what she was to him, the world never knew. Only those who had the privilege of intimacy are aware how absolutely true is the admirable tribute which this biography pays to her memory, while perhaps they will feel how little even this can come up to the actual living truth. Is it fair to ask, in passing, whether, for the sake of the Church, and especially of the wives of the clergy, who may so much help or mar the pastoral work of the Church, some picture of that pure and noble life may one day be given to the world?

From that day he began to fail. In a letter eminently pathetic in its characteristic truthfulness and simplicity, he says—

'I do not get the better of my grief. I am cheerful enough in society: my sympathies being easily aroused; but when I retire to my study, the happy past will come before me, and tears will flow as I think that all is gone.

'I am all right as to faith. When I take up her book of *Daily Meditations*, and raise my mind to heavenly thoughts, the "not lost but gone before" is full of blessed consolation. But I have lost my counsellor, my guide, the dear one who was always ready to soothe me in my troubles, to rouse me from my depression, and to urge me on to work: and sad is the blank which cannot be filled.'

After four years—still of work and usefulness—he also was called to his rest. There was something singularly touching and peaceful in his end. He had been accustomed to say that he did not fear death, but was afraid of dying. This pang was spared him—

"He had been accustomed," writes his son, "to give me his blessing after prayers till towards the end, when he asked me to act

more ministerially towards him. But on this evening he stopped me as I began, and spreading out his hands he pronounced the benediction over us. It was a moment of consciousness, and almost the last that he had. The whole of the last fourteen hours he was unconscious, and one may almost say that he passed away in sleep. So mercifully did our Heavenly Father have respect to the only weakness of the flesh that had given terror to the thought of death."

Such seem to us to be the chief points of the character and work which are so well described in Mr. Stephens' pages, which live still in the affectionate and reverent memory of friends, and in the ecclesiastical and spiritual life of Leeds, and which are written plainly enough in the history of our Church and country. Mr. Gladstone has described Dr. Hook's life as a 'heroic' life. Certainly it had in it elements of very real greatness. Of men for whom that title may be claimed, there are two classes. There are those whose power is concentrated on some one phase of thought and energy, who, kindled by the sacred fire of genius, or by a still more sacred inspiration, make the great steps forward in the history of the world, whether as thinkers and artists, or as lawgivers and rulers of men, or as prophets and evangelists. There are those whose energy is more diffused through various fields of thought and action; whose humanity grows up with less intensity but greater completeness; whose power works for God's glory by telling practically on the world at large, rather than by 'bursting into the silent sea' of original discovery. It is to the latter class that Dr. Hook belongs. But, if it be true that for greatness there are but two requisites—fulness of natural gifts, and earnest, unselfish devotion of all to a high and holy purpose—then, in both these requisites, but especially in the last, the life before us may well establish a claim to be called great.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Cambridge Bible for Schools. General Editor, J. J. S. PEROWNE, D.D., Dean of Peterborough. (For the Syndics of the University Press, Cambridge.)

1. *The First Book of Samuel.* With Map, Notes, and Introduction. By the Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, M.A., Fellow and Assistant-Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London: Cambridge Warehouse. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1880.)

REMEMBERING the interest with which we read the *Books of the Kingdoms* when they were appointed as a subject for school work in

our boyhood, we have looked with some eagerness into Mr. Kirkpatrick's volume, which contains the first instalment of them. We are struck with the great improvement in character, and variety in the materials, with which schools are now supplied. A clear map inserted in each volume, notes suiting the convenience of the scholar and the difficulty of the passage, and not merely dictated by the fancy of the commentator, were luxuries which a quarter of a century ago the Biblical student could not buy. He had, perhaps, Nicholls' *Help to the Reading of the Bible*, by no means a despicable book, published by S.P.C.K. It was a new book edited by a man who took his degree at Cambridge in 1825; it had maps on very flimsy paper, much folded and inevitably torn. It had splendid indices, one of which would direct the scholar to remarks upon about two verses in each chapter in the Bible; while in another part of the volume he would find an excellent but brief summary of each book. It was to be hoped that his teacher had a larger commentary. At all events a great deal would depend upon the master, so much so that if he had been brought up under the system that taught Scripture only through the Greek Testament,¹ and in illustration of other lessons, the Old Testament would most likely not be taught at all. But when it *was* taught, there would be a definiteness which in the greater diffusion of knowledge and of opinions it is now very hard to find. In modern commentaries the old order is reversed, and other books are employed to illustrate the Scripture. The scholar is often left to make the best he, or his master, can of a conflict of opinions. This uncertainty, however, is, we are happy to say, not a characteristic of Mr. Kirkpatrick's commentary. He often states a variety of opinions, but it is only an exceptional case where he leaves the question undetermined in part (an appendix on the text of chapters xvii. and xviii.), while he states clearly his opinion that the Septuagint represents the original form of the book. There is also no lack of clearness in theological and moral statements such as the following:—Nabal's death 'was a Divine judgment none the less that a partly natural cause may be assigned for it in his intemperance and passion' (xxv. 38). 'The Voice became a Vision. . . . The visible manifestations of Jehovah or the angel of Jehovah in the Old Testament were foreshadowings of the Incarnation' (iii. 10). 'It was not the witch who compelled Samuel to appear, but God who sent the spirit of His servant to confound her' (Appendix). Note V., 'On the Exterminating Wars of the Israelites' (in which the editor refers to Mozley's Lectures), is well worth reading. We quote only the last sentence:—'The fanatics of the seventeenth century, who sought to justify regicide by the example of Samuel and Agag, "knew not what spirit they were of." A translation of the Targum on ii. 1-10 is a sign that the Cambridge Orientalists are endeavouring to raise interest in their studies in our schools. The Appendix contains notes also on 'The Lord of Hosts,' 'The Name Jehovah,' 'The Philistines,'

¹ This was the system contemplated by Dr. W. Barrow (Bampton Lecturer in 1799) in his *Essay on Education*.

and the two events in the Hill of Hachilah. As to the notes themselves, we have found each single difficulty which puzzled us in our youth noticed and fairly solved; not indeed with Stackhouse's proximity, nor yet with any suggestion of satisfaction in doubting or in finding doubts to clear. Mr. Kirkpatrick shows his belief in the inspiration of the Old Testament (pp. 13, 86), and he half promises (p. 40) a consideration of David's character as a type in the second volume. In the index (which, by the way, contains, s.v. *Askelon*, the only typographical error which we have noticed, and that an obvious slip) there is a good list of references which would enable the student to construct an essay on the early life and character of David (pp. 204, 205 should have been included). The note on polygamy, i. 3, might perhaps be slightly modified by a reference to Gen. xxxi. 50. At least we trace in Laban's protest a corrupt relic of the commandment. The note on postures in prayer (i. 26) should have been slightly enlarged, or the references selected so as to show that prostration was not the *only* position with New Testament authority.

2. *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, together with the Lamentations.* With Map, Notes, and Introduction. By the Rev. A. W. STREANE, M.A., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. (London: Cambridge Warehouse. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1881.)

We can well imagine that this has been a difficult volume to annotate for a school commentary, and we think that we observe more direct reference to previous writers (such as Stanley, Dean Payne Smith, in the *Speaker's Commentary* and in the *Expositor*, Keil, Rawlinson, &c. &c.) Besides these moderns we think that we have noticed more than one observation which has come directly or indirectly from the Latin Fathers. Moreover—and this we hail as a characteristic of Mr. Streane's work—we see several extracts from eminent writers who have incidentally applied or commented on isolated passages of the prophet (S. Thomas Aquinas on xxvi. 15; Savonarola on xv. 10, **xx.** 8; Pascal on li. 18; Jeremy Taylor on xxx. 7, 9; and Pearson on x. 12). The note on 'Jeremiah as a Type of Christ,' contained in the Appendix, is derived from S. Jerome and Prof. Plumptre, but Mr. Streane's own note on i. 5 may be taken as enlarging on it. The arrangement of the book is well treated on pp. xxx., 396, and the question of Baruch's relations with its composition on pp. xxvii., xxxiv., 317. The illustrations from English literature, history, monuments, works on botany, topography, &c., are good and plentiful, as indeed they are in other volumes of this series. In the first line of the note on p. 210 'though' appears to be a misprint for 'through.' The map is not very clear, but that is doubtless owing to the hills which 'stand about Jerusalem.' It is rather a relief not to find Gareb and Goah marked among them. Besides what has been already specified the Appendix contains a summary of traditions relating to Jeremiah and to certain prophecies which have been ascribed to him.

The introduction to the Lamentations is excellent. A few words

might have been added about its liturgical use in the Christian Church. In the notes we do not observe any reference to S. Luke xxiii. 28.

The Prophecies of Isaiah. A New Translation with Commentary and Appendices. By the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Balliol College, Oxford, and Member of the Old Testament Revision Company. 2 vols. (London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1880-1881.)

THE distinctive character of this remarkable work is described in the dedication prefixed to the second volume. It is 'an attempt to combine modern methods of exegesis with fidelity to ancient truth.' It therefore aims at doing what many assume to be impossible, and for this reason we fear it may fail to meet the reception which it deserves. On the one hand, advocates of what may be called the orthodox view of Old Testament exegesis will be startled, perhaps shocked and repelled, by the author's views on many points: such, for example, as the limitations of prophetic inspiration, and the process of compilation and remodelling by which the utterances of Isaiah, together with those of other nameless prophets of various ages, were brought together into their present form. On the other hand, disciples of the 'higher criticism' will be tempted to refuse a fair hearing to a work in which the Divinely prophetic character of the Old Testament is constantly and staunchly maintained. Between these extremes, however, lies a class of students to whom the book will be a real boon. To those—and nowadays they cannot be few—who, while they hold firmly to the essentials of the Christian faith, are feeling the manifold critical difficulties which beset the Old Testament records, and wondering whether a reconciliation of the old faith and the new science is possible, Mr. Cheyne's book will be welcome. To such students it will, we believe, prove a substantial help, and may do good service in saving them from the religious paralysis in which Biblical criticism of a certain type is liable to end. And those who cannot agree with the writer's critical views ought at least to be attracted by the spirit of deep reverence for the Bible which breathes in every page, while those who might feel antecedent prejudice against his religious views ought certainly to admire the fearless candour and transparent honesty of purpose which marks a genuine seeker after truth.

Mr. Cheyne's work is a book for students, not for casual readers. A knowledge of Hebrew is of course advantageous, though not indispensable, as most of the critical notes requiring such knowledge are relegated to an appendix. 'The commentary does not aim at being exhaustive, but mainly at drawing attention to points which seem to have been inadequately considered by previous commentators.' The writer's earlier works on Isaiah¹ are not altogether superseded

¹ (1) *Notes and Criticisms on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah*, 1868.
(2) *The Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged*. An amended version, with Historical and Critical Introductions and Explanatory Notes, 1870.

by it, though ten years of study have led him to modify his views on various points.

'The present work is exclusively exegetical; it appears to the author that a more thorough exegesis must precede the fruitful investigation of critical problems. It is the interest of all parties to ascertain the exegetical data. . . . If it is a fact that the exegetical phenomena are conflicting, let them be fairly represented as such; the final critical solution will have to take account of all the data of the problem. This attempt at impartiality, or (if the reader will) this disregard of consistency, is one feature of this commentary. Another is the use made of the Assyrian inscriptions. A third feature is the investigation, or at least illustration, of the forms of belief, and of the progress of doctrine, in this and the cognate prophetic literature.'

The first of these features ought not to be a novelty, but unfortunately it is. 'Most English books on Isaiah carry their theological origin on their forefront.' The bias of their writers has, we fear it must be confessed, influenced their critical conclusions. But Mr. Cheyne has in an eminent degree a candid mind and 'the courage of his convictions.' He wishes to serve no cause but the cause of truth. Though 'he belongs to a school of interpretation,' mainly, at any rate, composed of rationalists, he 'has come to believe most firmly in a definitely Christian interpretation of the Old Testament.' The third of the essays appended to the second volume, for which the author bespeaks a specially patient and candid perusal, discusses *The Christian Element in the Book of Isaiah*. No extracts can do justice to this essay. It is in effect a chapter of autobiography, which strongly claims our sympathy, and, we believe, will cheer and help not a few who are seeking for light. The following quotations will give some idea of the position which the author occupies and the struggle by which it has been reached:—

'Everything in the Old Testament stands in some relation to Christ, whether definitely or not. . . . Not that the laws of human nature were violated, not that Christian interpreters are to explain the prophets unphilologically, but that God overruled the actions and words of His servants, so as to cast a shadow of the coming Christ. . . . In short, there are two fixed points with the class of students here represented: 1. That, in order to prepare susceptible minds for the Saviour, a special providential guidance may be presumed to have been given to the course of certain selected lives and the utterance of certain inspired personages; and 2. That this presumption is converted into a certainty by our Lord's authoritative interpretation of the Old Testament. To accept these two fixed points is to many persons a very real "cross." The torrents of ridicule which have been poured out upon "circumstantial fulfilments" have left a general impression that they can only be admitted by doing violence to grammar and context, which to a modern student is nothing short of "plucking out" his "right eye." Hence many "liberal" theologians have been fain to stunt their religion in favour, as they suppose, of their philology, and their example has been followed with less excuse by many who are guiltless of special study. But must there not be some mistake both on the side of the cross-bearers and of the cross-rejecters? Can it be that human nature is "divided against itself," and left to choose between intellectual and religious mutilation? Here at least scepticism.

is the truest piety. It is the conviction of the writer that there is a "more excellent way," and that the philological and the Christian interpretation can be honestly combined, without any unworthy compromise.¹

The use made of the Assyrian inscriptions is a second special feature of the commentary. That the commentator on the Old Testament must take full account of these will now be generally admitted. Few will share Dr. Kay's opinion that the decipherments are only tentative, and 'cannot be held to furnish materials of authentic history.'¹ At the same time it must be borne in mind that whole libraries may yet be disinterred, which may substantially modify the results as yet attained, so that all conclusions must be regarded as in some degree provisional. These inscriptions throw light on the historical circumstances of many of the prophecies. For example, they give us a full account of the reign of the Assyrian monarch Sargon, who is mentioned but once in the Old Testament (Is. xx. 1), and was supposed by earlier commentators to be identical with Sennacherib. At the same time they bring to light fresh chronological difficulties, especially in regard to Sennacherib's invasion of Judah. These are fully discussed by Mr. Cheyne in the historical introduction to chaps. xxxvi.-xxxix.

The illustrations derived from the Assyrian texts do not relate to questions of chronology only. Allusions to Babylonian beliefs in Isaiah are confirmed by the language of the inscriptions. The character of Cyrus, as it may be gathered from them, is compared with the prophet's estimate of him. Here again a new difficulty arises. It has generally been supposed that he was a pure monotheist, 'not very far from the kingdom of God.' He is now shown to have been 'a complete religious indifferentist.' How, then, are we to account for the strong language of the prophet concerning him? By observing 'the gracious proportion between the revelation vouchsafed and the mental state of the person receiving it. There is no defect implied in the revelation, but only in the receptiveness of the human organ.' The prophet was too simple and straightforward to realize a complicated policy, such as that of Cyrus, and viewed him just as he saw him acting towards the cause which he had at heart.

The investigation of the progress of doctrine in the prophetic literature, which is the third special aim of the work, is a branch of study which has been too much neglected. The development of Old Testament theology, or, in other words, God's gradual revelation of Himself 'in many parts and in many fashions,' demands careful study, and, whether Mr. Cheyne's results commend themselves to the reader or not, the treatment of the questions involved cannot fail to be stimulating and suggestive.

The essays which occupy the second half of the second volume are perhaps the most interesting part of the whole work. Besides the one already referred to on *The Christian Element in the Book of Isaiah*, which possesses an altogether exceptional importance, those on *The Present State of the Critical Controversy* and on

¹ *Speaker's Commentary on Isaiah*, p. 143.

Isaiah and his Commentators are particularly attractive. The first of these essays is a suggestive sketch, not an exhaustive discussion, of the various solutions proposed of the complicated problem of the authorship of 'Isaiah.' The following quotations indicate the view to which the author inclines:—

'It is becoming more and more certain that the present form, especially of the prophetic Scriptures, is due to a literary class (the so-called Soferim, "scribes" or "Scripturists"), whose principal function was collecting and supplementing the scattered records of prophetic revelation. . . . The view that the author of chaps. xl.-lxvi. not only put old ideas and phrases into a new setting, but also incorporated the substance of connected discourses of that great prophet, of whose style we are so often reminded in these chapters—Isaiah—offers two especial advantages: (1) it gives a very simple explanation of the linguistic points of contact between the original and the "Babylonian" Isaiah; and (2) it dispenses us from the necessity of assuming (against the context) such a suspension of the laws of psychology as is implied on the traditional theory by the mention of "Cyrus" in xlv. 28, xlv. 1. . . . It is possible that it may some day become an approximate certainty that the latter part of 2 Isaiah was once much shorter, and that the author, or one of the Soferim, enlarged it by the insertion of passages from other prophets.'

The essay on Isaiah's commentators opens with a not unneeded protest against the prevalent practice 'of interpolating exegetical observations with a long array of names of authorities,' which to nine readers out of ten convey no living impression at all. The description here given of the characteristics of the chief commentators on Isaiah, especially modern ones, will help to give the reader who has no leisure to study their works for himself some idea of their relative value.

The essay on *The Correction of the Hebrew Text* offers a necessary corrective to the almost superstitious reverence for the text of the Old Testament, which is still too common in this country. The history of the Hebrew text is extremely obscure. But our oldest MSS. are not older than the tenth century, and these, though preserving faithfully the received Hebrew text, as settled some time before the close of the fifth century A.D., give no help for correcting the corruptions of an earlier period. Hence conjectural emendation, which is out of place in New Testament criticism, is here permissible. But it must be employed with great caution. It is useless to quote instances without giving arguments, and space does not admit of our doing this, but we think that Mr. Cheyne is too ready to alter the text on slight pretexts. Bengel's canon *proclivi lectioni præstat ardua* is a valuable monitor. Conjectural emendation is always liable to fall foul of the solecisms of genius, and tends to reduce the text to a dead level of mediocrity.

Mr. Cheyne's revised translation is evidently designed for the help of the student who does not understand Hebrew, not for popular reading. It is always an advantage to have familiar words recast into a fresh shape, which forces us to ponder on their meaning, and there are not a few passages of Isaiah in which the sense is quite obscured by false or inadequate renderings in the Authorized Version.

But Mr. Cheyne's translation seems to us sometimes painfully literal, at other times causelessly loose. Is it worth while in a translation of this character to adopt a loose rendering, such as that in chap. i. 23, 'Thy law-makers are law-breakers,' merely for the sake of preserving a *paronomasia*? Again, why translate the same word by 'wicked' in one verse and 'ungodly' in the next? 'But the *wicked* are like the sea that is tost up. . . . There is no peace, saith my God, for the *ungodly*' (lvii. 21). This change destroys the connexion, and introduces a false antithesis between 'God' and 'the ungodly.' On the whole, however, the translation is faithful, and we do not doubt will be found helpful for students who desire as exact a representation of the original as it is possible to give in another language.

We commend the work to the careful attention of all students of the Old Testament. We do not expect our readers to agree with many of the opinions advanced in it. But if they will examine it with patience and an unbiassed desire to give the writer a fair hearing, they cannot fail to respect the tone and spirit of his work, whether they are convinced or not by his arguments. It is from diligent study carried out in this spirit of perfect candour and profound reverence that fruitful results may be expected in Biblical exegesis and criticism. *Pectus est, quod theologum facit.*

A Commentary on the Book of Job, with a Translation. By SAMUEL COX, Editor of the *Expositor*. (London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1880.)

THE Book of Job has won for itself in many ways the constant attention of thoughtful men. The beauty of its language, and dramatic form; the power and distinctness of its various characters; the vivid description of circumstance and scene, alike compel admiration; while the solution it offers to some of the most perplexing enigmas of life is perhaps second to none of the sacred writings. Mr. Cox confesses to being 'fairly mastered by it, fascinated by its charm.' 'Laying aside all other work,' he 'brooded over it night and day' in the effort to render its 'sonorous and suggestive Hebrew into the best English' he 'could command.' The volume now before us is a happy witness to its author's zeal and ability; nor can he regret in the least the loving labour bestowed upon it through a period of fourteen years. For the most part the work has appeared in the pages of the *Expositor*.

Mr. Cox, with most of his predecessors, has found in this ancient Scripture the rebuke of that hard judgment which would see in the chances and calamities of life an immediate effort of some avenging power. He has also found in it a sovereign antidote, as he believes, 'to the scepticism which modern science has bred.' But, further and higher still, he maintains the ruling intention of the poem to have been this: 'the proving that God is capable of winning, and that man is capable of cherishing, an unselfish and disinterested goodness; that he *can* serve God for nought, that he can hold fast his confidence in God even when that supreme Friend seems to be turned into his Foe.' While, if such be the heavenward face of the

problem which the writer of Job set himself to solve, the earthly side of his endeavour, though not expressed, is assuredly not concealed, and may be briefly stated thus : ' that the dark mystery of human life is capable of a happy solution ; that the afflictions of the righteous are designed for correction, not for punishment ; and that the inequalities of this life are to be redressed in the life to come.' But, what seems to us of much more worth to the student than these interpretations of the book, Mr. Cox ably demonstrates the new polemical value it has received by the attitude and tone of modern unbelief. The effort of the author of *Supernatural Religion*, and his school, is to praise morality at the expense of Christianity, and on all sides to reject the very idea of and wish for a Divine revelation. Assuredly ' it would be hard to find a more cogent and complete answer to this argument than that supplied by the Book of Job.' Its hero fulfils abundantly all the demands of a high and pure and noble life ; at the same time the tumult of his soul marks him most intensely human. If the new sceptical contention, therefore, be right, he ought to have been supremely self-satisfied. But the one overmastering desire of the man is to know God ; ' his whole soul goes forth in a piercing cry for the very revelation which our modern sceptics pronounce utterly superfluous.' Tradition and mental conception failed to satisfy the need ; and we behold him tortured by the very longing which they assure us was ' impossible he could ever experience.'

Mr. Cox's division of the poem is more on the old lines than we should have imagined : consisting chiefly of the prologue, the curse pronounced by Job on his day, the three colloquies with his friends, his soliloquy, the intervention of Elihu, the theophany, the epilogue.

In the first colloquy Eliphaz begins the indictment of the sufferer, and is followed by Bildad and Zophar, each being answered in turn by Job. The second naturally divides itself in like manner ; but with the third the first great critical question of the book begins. It is well known that many of our English commentators, and most of the German, have seen with Kennicott a violation of the structure of the poem, according to its present arrangement, whereby Eliphaz and Bildad alone appear to enter the lists, to be vanquished in turn. Verses 8 to 23 of chap. xxvii. are therefore claimed on the part of Zophar, Job's answer to whom extends from chap. xxvii. to the end of chap. xxxi. But Mr. Cox will have none of this amended text, and stoutly maintains the more orthodox view, excellently explaining Job's supposed inconsistency in the verses alleged to be Zophar's and calling the four succeeding chapters a soliloquy of two-monologues.

Without being able to see all the delicate strokes and differentiating touches which some commentators have found in the characteristics of the three friends, Mr. Cox connects Eliphaz with the prophetic order and Bildad with those men who depend rather on tradition ; but, while claiming for both these great erudition, he

denies it to Zophar, regarding him as the common good man of the day.

If the answer to this latter worthy's second attack were not sufficiently overwhelming, Mr. Cox considers him 'reduced to wondering and indignant silence' by the eloquence with which Job had 'driven the venerable Eliphaz to mere calumny and detraction, and drawn the scholastic Bildad away from his maxims and authorities.' No room is left, therefore, for the contention of Eichorn and Froude; and, in fact, we may feel with Ewald that 'only a grievous misunderstanding of the whole book could have misled the modern critics who hold that the passage is interpolated or misplaced.'

Mr. Cox frankly tells us with what regret and surprise he has been led to vindicate the authenticity of chaps. xxxiii.-xxxvii., containing the account of Elihu; and some of our readers—not the least learned, nor most destructive in their criticism—will share in his astonishment, though they would scarcely venture with Mr. Froude to dispose of the question *suo more* by declaring that the speech is 'now decisively pronounced by Hebrew scholars not to be genuine.' As usual, the German camp is divided; and, if Ewald and Bernstein reject the intervention, others, with Berthold and Umbreit, accept it with every mark of contempt; while Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and all the moderate critics receive it with more or less cordiality. Mr. Cox defends his plea at some length, with less than his wonted perspicuity; but the whole argument (pp. 408-416) is worthy of careful analysis and consideration. And it is refreshing to read his indignant comments on the 'critics who seem transported beyond all bounds of reason and patience by the mere mention of Elihu's name.'

The Commentary is not intended to be one of pure criticism and scholarship, but 'an exposition which any man of ordinary culture may read.' It speaks well for the religious body to which Mr. Cox belongs that it can boast of many minds with sufficient appreciation of his learning and diligence. Most, if not all, the difficult words and passages are discussed fairly in, for the most part, clear, incisive English. We specially note the explanation of the word rendered 'ashes' or 'dung,' i.e. the Arabic *Mezbele*. And, if even the commentator's knowledge of matters Oriental went not much further than Professor Palmer's translations, it would still have the merit of good selection; and he has certainly escaped the censure of Young on those of his brethren who

' each dark passage shun,
And hold a farthing candle to the sun.'

Of course we turned to chap. xix. 25-27 at an early period of our review, and were well repaid for the trouble; while the quotation from *Richard III.* showing the double use of 'from' is apt and good. In fact, the writer's familiarity with Shakspeare would enable him to make almost a continuous parallel for the poem.

Among the many amusing bits of the book ¹ is the warm vindica-

¹ Not the least of which are its odd quotations and illustrations, as that of Carlyle on p. 55.

tion of Job's wife. 'Dinah' has been delivered by the chivalry of Mr. Cox from the ranks of the Misunderstood (pp. 50-52), and may henceforth be considered the right worthy mate of such a man as was her husband. It is consoling (though our commentator has half a mind to regret it) that we are told what afterwards befell this afflicted woman; and we are glad to think the writer of the book so far yielded to what his latest expositor thinks were 'the limitations of his age,' abandoning the higher *dénouement* which he himself was able to grasp, and carrying his story to a conclusion such as his own generation was able to receive.

It is not, perhaps, out of place to express our regret here at the mutilation the Book of Job has suffered at the hands of the compilers of our last Lectionary, chapters i.-xxvi., xxx.-xxxvii., xxxix.-xlii., being entirely omitted from the Sunday lessons, and viii., xv., xviii., xx., xxii. 1-11 and 29-30, xxx. 2-11 and 27-31, xxxi. 1-12, and xxxiii.-xxxvii. from even the daily course.

The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: External Evidences. By EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D. (London: Trübner and Co. Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1880.)

THE learned professor of New Testament criticism and interpretation at Harvard University has been a little unfortunate in the choice of a title for his essay, as it really makes no sort of pretence to survey the whole field of the external evidences in favour of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, as the title-page would lead us to expect. Indeed, in an essay of only ninety pages no less than sixty are occupied with the discussion of the evidence of but one writer, Justin Martyr; while the remaining thirty are devoted to the consideration of only three other points, namely:

1. The general reception of the four Gospels as genuine among Christians in the last quarter of the second century.
2. The use of the Fourth Gospel by the various Gnostic sects.
3. The attestation to this Gospel which has come down to us appended to the book itself.

Thus it will be seen that no attempt is made to examine the whole question of the external evidences. Nothing, for instance, is said of Papias, or of the Ignatian Epistles, or of the testimony of Polycarp to the First Epistle of S. John (carrying with it as it does a testimony to the Gospel), or of the silence of Eusebius. On all these points the writer contents himself with referring to the works of Bishop Lightfoot and others, while of the four points which he has selected to deal with himself no less than three are, it seems to us, inadequately dealt with. Under his last head, for example, something more might surely have been said of that circle of Ephesian elders and others who seem to have surrounded the aged Apostle, and whose presence is indicated by the use of the second person in the Gospel itself in such passages as c. xix. 35, 'And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe;' or in xx. 31, 'These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that he be-

lieving *ye* might have life through His name.' Were not these the men who hung on the words of the last survivor of the Apostles, and took down as it flowed from his lips that marvellous selection of his Master's words and deeds, and then appended to the Gospel thus published to the world their own attestation of its Apostolic authorship, c. xxi. 24 :—'This is that disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things ; and *we* know that his testimony is true' ? So also, under the head of the general reception of the Gospel in the last quarter of the second century, the evidence of Irenæus requires emphasizing, partly from his early residence in Asia Minor and his connexion with Polycarp, and partly from his famous passage on the fourfold Gospel (*Adv. Hær.* III. xi. 8) ; a passage in which he endeavours to show that it was a necessity that there should be neither more nor less than *four* Gospels, as there were *four* quarters of the world, *four* winds, &c. ; and which—whatever we may think of his arguments—is tolerably convincing evidence that, so far back as his own recollection extended, the Church had recognized all the four Gospels which we at present possess, and no others.

On the subject of Justin Martyr, however, Dr. Ezra Abbot has more to say, and says it well. And we commend it to the notice of his English namesake, who, as appears from the interesting but not altogether satisfactory article on 'Gospels' in the ninth volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, is still unconvinced that Justin made use of the Fourth Gospel. In his treatment of Justin's loose quotations, e.g. that of S. John iii. 3–5, Dr. Ezra Abbot is especially happy, and has collected a large number of instances of precisely similar loose quotations of the same passages in writers who are universally allowed to have known and used the Fourth Gospel ; and thus he shows conclusively that, if we are to argue on the principles adopted by the author of *Supernatural Religion*, we must believe not only that so eminent a divine as Jeremy Taylor was in the habit of using Apocryphal Gospels, but also that such are actually quoted in our own Book of Common Prayer—

'inasmuch as it professes to give the very words of Christ, and gives them *twice* in precisely the same form : "Our Saviour Christ saith, *None can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost*"',—

a quotation which, it will be observed, is not a verbally exact one of S. John iii. 3, and therefore, as the Prayer Book 'clearly professes to make an exact quotation' (to borrow a phrase from *Supernatural Religion*), not drawn from it, but from some other unknown source—say, the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

One other point we must notice, the excellent way in which Dr. Abbot disposes of the extraordinary supply of *contingent* knowledge possessed by some writers, i.e. the knowledge of what certain ancient authors *would* or *would not* have said, if they had possessed certain books. It is really astonishing to what an extent this kind of argument is used by some schools of critics. For instance, Dr. Abbot cites Thoma and F. C. J. van Goens as arguing that Justin cannot

have seen the Fourth Gospel, because he speaks of Christ as 'keeping silence and refusing any longer to make any answer to anyone before Pilate, as has been declared in the memoirs by the Apostles' (*Dial.* c. 102). 'No one,' writes M. van Goens, 'who had ever read the Fourth Gospel could speak in this way.' To this Dr. Abbot pertinently replies with the question, 'What does M. van Goens think of Tertullian, who says, *Velut agnus coram tondente se sine voce, sic non aperuit os suum. Hic enim Pilato interrogante nihil locutus est*' (*Adv. Jud.* c. xiii.)? And elsewhere he says on the same subject—

'A multitude of questions may be asked, to which no particular answer can be given, in reference to the use which Justin and writers in all ages have made of our Gospels. We cannot say why he has quoted this saying of Jesus and not that, or referred to this incident in the history and not that. . . . But one needs only to try experiments on particular works by almost any writer to find that great caution is required in drawing inferences from what he has *not* done'—(p. 69).

Some amusing experiments are added, which are amply sufficient to prove the point in question, if indeed it still requires proving; for the false principles that underlie the whole treatment of the subject of the references of early Fathers to the New Testament by the author of *Supernatural Religion* have been so fully and so frequently exposed, that it may seem almost needless to attempt to do over again work that has been so ably done by Bishop Lightfoot, Dr. Sanday, and others; but it appears that there are still some men who find it hard to acknowledge that writers in the second century *did* quote inexactly, and *did* sometimes overlook things and make mistakes, just as men do in the nineteenth: some, we say, who find it hard to acknowledge this when the acknowledgment would deprive them of an argument against the genuineness of the Gospels, though at other times they are ready enough to appeal to the uncritical character of the Fathers and the absurdities which they were prone to accept. And so there is still room for an essay such as this, and we are disposed to welcome Dr. Ezra Abbot's little book, not merely as giving in a convenient form the argument for Justin Martyr's use of the Fourth Gospel, but as being in itself a substantial addition to the literature of the subject.

The Englishman's Hebrew Bible, and the English Greek Testament.

By THOMAS NEWBERRY. (London: Bagster and Sons, 1880.)

THESE volumes are monuments of ingenious and patient labour and of devout love for the sacred texts; but we regret to say that, in our opinion, the excellent author's pains are all thrown away. His aim is to add such symbols, and marks, and hyphens, and capitals, and varied types, to the text of the Authorized Version of each Testament as may enable a student who knows nothing of Hebrew or of Greek to understand and appreciate the subtleties and idiomatic peculiarities of the original languages. As Mr. Newberry words it on his title-page, his intention is 'to place the English reader in a position as near as possible to that of a Hebrew scholar,' and to 'show

many of the Divine perfections and hidden beauties of the inspired originals.' Every scholar knows that this is an impossible task. A perfect translation from one language to another will convey every idea and shade of meaning of the original, not in a bald reproduction of the original idioms, but under the proper forms of the language in which the version is made. We suppose that most students, when they first apprehend the 'hidden beauties' of a language hitherto unknown to them, desire to communicate their vivid impressions to others who have not enjoyed their experience; but they soon find that there is no royal road to teaching any more than to learning. A man might as well learn Hebrew and Greek as Mr. Newberry's complicated symbols, which are quite as puzzling to a reader as the vowel-points to a young Hebraist. For our own part, we regret that Mr. Newberry has not used his indefatigable perseverance in suggesting amendments of the text of the Authorized Version. His labours then would have assisted, if not the revisers, yet the multitudes who will anxiously criticize the revision when it appears. But none the less do we honour the piety and zeal which have produced the volumes before us.

An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion. By JOHN CAIRD, D.D., Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Glasgow, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains for Scotland. (Glasgow: James Maclehose, 1880.)

It is probable that there always have been and always will be two classes of minds turned towards the things of faith and ready to receive the message from on high. There must be many who, without any loss of dignity or sincerity, any repression of natural powers or renunciation of spiritual progress, can rest with the author of the *Imitatio Christi* and refuse 'to dispute much about dark and hidden things, for ignorance of which we shall not be reproved at the day of judgment.' There must be others standing with S. Anselm, as he declares in the words which Dr. Caird has set upon his title page, 'negligentia mihi videtur si, postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus intelligere quod credimus.' The revelation of God invites and welcomes and quickens and surpasses every exercise of every intelligence which has its origin and end in Him. 'Divinus enim sermo, sicut mysteriis prudentes exercet, sic plerumque superficie simplices refovet.' By some the highest life, the clearest light, will be attained through a period in which the reason seems to man to be quiescent; others will ever be moving nearer to the full truth through the persistent resolve and effort of the human understanding, ἐφ' ὅσον ἐνδέχεται, ἀθαρσιζέτω.

To minds of the latter class Dr. Caird's book will come as a great and rare gift. The conditions and temper of modern thought have probably added intensity to their desire and effort towards a philosophic presentment of Christianity. They are deeply and painfully conscious of the disadvantage which the Church seems to suffer by the decisive, systematic, and unqualified form in which the case of her opponents can be put. Souls appear to be passing beyond

the reach of her help because she has no formulæ which can compete with the effective phraseology of Materialism, no clear and inevitable reproof for the vagueness and indolence of the Agnostic; and it is hard to be otherwise than restless while there seems any excuse for the asseveration that Christianity has left to her antagonists the field of philosophic thought. Those who believe that in the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity and of the Incarnation they hold the only satisfaction which can be given to the highest inquiries, the deepest longings, of the human intellect—the very truths which prophets and wise men in every age have desired to see and have not seen—must be eager to confront with the light from heaven the rival assertions which, whether in presumption or despair, are advanced upon its proper domain; they must anxiously look for the day when in the great battle of speculative thought God may arise and His enemies be scattered, and they also that hate Him may flee before Him.

If this is so, if in the intellectual tumult and ever-quickenning excitement of the present day there is a real need and an honest craving that the Church should, as she has often done, speak to men according to their especial wants, and present the eternal and unchanging truth in the form of a complete and supreme philosophy, then the book with which this notice is concerned is one of very great importance. It is an appeal against the sentence of divorce which would put asunder the Divinely wedded faculties of faith and reason, and, taking from the latter the keys of supersensuous knowledge, bid her '*suas res habere*.' It is an effort to emancipate philosophy from the restrictions imposed upon it both by the hasty dogmatism of Mr. Spencer and his followers and by the fear or reverence of an unquestioning piety. Whatever may be thought of the result attained, a tribute of sincere admiration is due to the rare power, grace, earnestness, and accuracy with which the author has worked at the task which he has undertaken. The reader feels throughout that he is in contact with a truthful, vigorous, and resolute mind, which comes to the intense effort of the book with deep insight, a single purpose, and a peculiar faculty of exact expression.

It may be well to sketch briefly the main lines of Dr. Caird's argument, and then to say what seems necessary to be said in qualification of the system which he has adopted.

He first encounters and disputes the three chief objections which are brought against the competency of reason to enter on the province of religion, arguing that thought cannot accept the identification of the knowable with the relative; that the assertion of an immediate or intuitive knowledge of Divine truth cannot silence the appeal to the objective authority of reason itself; and thirdly, that 'it is only because the content of a revelation is implicitly rational that it can possess' any self-evidencing power, or exert any moral influence over the human spirit.' He then goes on, in the fourth chapter,—a passage of great power and value,—to expound the hidden logic by which the human spirit is ever and essentially urged to transcend its own individuality, 'to rise above the region of sensation,

and to enter into communion with that which is universal and objective,' tracing the movement of this impulse first as an inherent necessity in the very nature of thought; and secondly, as expressed in the three great arguments through which the spirit shows its restlessness, and rises to the knowledge of God, the fulfilment of its true vocation. In the next three chapters the author reaches the central and all-controlling thought of his philosophy. Having recognized the high value of the ordinary or unscientific forms of religious knowledge, and owning that 'there are various ways in which a mind, by supposition incapable of grasping spiritual truth in a scientific form, may yet attain to a knowledge of it which is substantially true, and which may suffice for religious and moral ends—nay, may for these ends be more potent and inspiring than scientific or purely speculative knowledge'—and having then contended that there are even in the highest forms of such popular apprehension faults, or tendencies to fault, which prove its incompetency as the organon of the spirit's purest activity, he passes on to describe that freer movement, that higher method of reconciliation, by which thought can not only reveal the differences and contradictions of the spiritual world, but cause them to vanish in a richer and deeper unity. The main argument of the book seems complete at the close of the eighth chapter; but there follow two more: the ninth, an essay of admirable beauty and engrossing interest upon the relation of morality and religion, and the life of prayer; the tenth, dealing with the interdependence and mutual subvention of philosophy and history in regard to the study of religion, and tracing its implicit logic in the sequence of its historical forms.

It will be seen even from this inadequate summary of the book that it is throughout Hegelian. The ultimate relation of Hegelianism to Christianity may not yet be fully seen. Some may hope that, in the providence of God, it may become for many minds *υποβάθρι της κατὰ Χριστὸν φιλοσοφίας*; others may distrust the narrow foothold under which the dark sea which bears the name of Pantheism waits for the unwary climber. But all who long that men may be rescued from the easy tyranny of a thoughtless and thought-destroying scepticism must be grateful to Dr. Caird in so far as he has proved afresh that in the essential actions of the human spirit there is the prophecy of an infinite calling, and reaffirmed the hope that men may rise from the contradictions of human life and history to that loftier point of view where they vanish away in the thought of Him of whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things.

And doubtless those who need assurance of a better hope, a worthier life, than Mr. Spencer can devise for them, may find in Dr. Caird's work a source of present help and, it may be, of life-long gratitude. Yet those who come from the clear light, the unhindered confidence of the Sacramental Life, to seek in these pages another rendering of the hope that is in them, may feel as they read that somehow they have long known far more than all that these great sentences, these striving antitheses, can teach them: that there are truths without which they cannot live, which here they do not

plainly recognize ; and that though they may be led from chapter to chapter by the delightful echoes of the highest human thought, they miss the only Voice which can tell them with authority, 'This is the way ; walk thou in it.' To some it may even seem that this new doctrine has, for a while, taken away their Lord, and filled the air about His gracious throne with clouds and darkness of impenetrable depth. For such the book will fail of its author's clear and sincere intention, and may be a source of pain, or even peril, rather than of pleasure or of strength. Yet even they might perhaps be patient of its incompleteness if they could know the multitude of those from whom the first conviction of a spiritual life is hid, who have yielded up the only hope that can ennoble earth to the facile dogmas and convenient phrases of a contented Agnosticism. They might suspend for a moment the utmost judgment of their clearer insight, and might trust, in regard to such books as this, that ὁ Θεὸς διὰ πάντων τούτων ἔλκει τὴν ψυχὴν ὅπου ἂν βούληται τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

It must seem presumptuous to suggest at the close of a short notice that there may be one pervading and vitiating defect in the great argument of this book. But the suggestion is invited by Dr. Caird's own challenge (p. 50) ; and, if valid, it accounts for almost all the lacunæ which appear to mar his work as a philosophic expression of the Christian faith. It has been anticipated by Pascal :—

'Il semble que la source des erreurs d'Epictète et des Stoïciens d'une part, de Montaigne et des Epicuriens de l'autre, est de n'avoir pas su que l'état de l'homme à présent diffère de celui de sa création.' . . . 'Car enfin, si l'homme n'avait jamais été corrompu, il jouirait de la vérité et de la félicité avec assurance. Et si l'homme n'avait jamais été que corrompu, il n'aurait aucune idée ni de la vérité ni de la béatitude. Mais malheureux que nous sommes, et plus que s'il n'y avait aucune grandeur dans notre condition, nous avons une idée du bonheur, et ne pouvons y arriver ; nous sentons une image de la vérité, et ne possédons que le mensonge : incapables d'ignorer absolument et de savoir certainement, tant il est manifeste que nous avons été dans un degré de perfection dont nous sommes malheureusement tombés.' . . . 'Sans cela (sans le péché original) que dira-t-on qu'est l'homme ? Tout son état dépend de ce point imperceptible.'¹

Let us hear on the other side Dr. Caird :—

'All science starts with the tacit presupposition that nature is intelligible, that there is reason and thought in things ; and its progress is only the ever-advancing discovery of laws, of rational relations, of a coherent, self-consistent system, in the objects and events of the material world. The history of science is the history of mind or of intelligence finding itself in nature. And the same principle applies to the higher investigations which deal with man and the social and moral relations of the spiritual world. Here, too, the presupposition which constitutes the stimulus and the final cause of inquiry is that the world of mind is an intelligible world, that thought and reason will find itself—elicit the hidden presence of rational relations, of an objective reason—in the facts and events it contemplates. Nor when we rise above nature and man, above the whole finite world to that out of which all its phenomena spring, can the universal presupposition fail us.'²

¹ *Pensées*, pp. 131, 180, 181, ed. Didot, 1870.

² Pp. 25, 26.

So again :—

‘Either the doctrines of positive religion must be shown to be in harmony with reason, or at least reason must be silent as to their truth or falsehood.’¹

And again :—

‘If it is possible to advance from faith to science—in other words, to attain, in the sphere of religion, to knowledge in the philosophic sense of the word—there must be an organ of thought by means of which we can perceive and correct the inadequacy of ordinary thinking, and apprehend spiritual realities in their purely ideal form.’²

It is surely just to say that such claims as these, advanced on behalf of the human reason as it now is and moves, ignore, in revelation, the record of the Fall, and, in history and experience, the confusion, disorder, fragmentariness, and failure which mar and mislead our moral and intellectual life. In the world around us, and in our own characters, we find indications of a fall, a flaw, a deformity ; we live unequally, by baffled efforts, by broken lights ; we have our higher moments of purity and hope, our lowest depths of depression and darkness. Have we not every reason to expect that the cause which has wrought this ruin and disorder within and around us has also touched the faculty of thought ? Coherence, consistency, completeness, these are the last attributes which we should claim for our own moral life, or for the world in which we live. Can we hope that our reason can anticipate, discover, recognize, or test this manifestation in the sphere of infinite truth ? To renounce this hope is not to withdraw from all effort towards a philosophic understanding of Christianity ; we do not despair of holiness because of the irregularity and incompleteness of our moral life. In both cases the fragments which remain are fragments of the Image in which we were made ; the broken lights come forth from Him with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. Only it would seem reasonable to anticipate that as His ways are not as our ways, so neither may our thought find itself without qualification in His thoughts ; that an Atonement must have been offered for and pleaded by the reason as well as the will, in order that it may enter into the glorious liberty of the children of God ; and that it too may find its highest exercise through an act of self-renunciation which only the sacrifice of Christ has rendered possible.

William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic: a Sketch of his Life, Character, and Opinions. By J. H. OVERTON, M.A., Vicar of Legbourne. (London: Longmans and Co. 1881.)

A VOLUME from the pen of Mr. Overton is welcome, which shows his leisure to have been well employed since his recent contribution towards the Church history of the eighteenth century. It treats of a truly noble character, and one to whose genius Mr. Overton appears from his work well fitted to do justice. A proper inspiration was the

¹ P. 71.

² P. 188.

desire expressed in his opening page to rescue from almost universal neglect among the present generation, nor rightly appreciated in his own day, a name so intrinsically worthy as that of William Law, the 'Nonjuror and Mystic.' He has not only displayed the taste of a connoisseur in discovering a beautiful portrait underneath a load of inferior productions, but has the art of framing and hanging it in a favourable light for the public to study its merits. And it is no little reproach to the nineteenth century that no use should have been made until now of the materials for a suitable biography which Mr. Overton has brought together. Whether William Law's family were of tradesmen in a higher or lower grade, 'of high respectability and good means,' or not, is a question of no concern, except so far as the 'good means' staved off that poverty which has crushed many a brilliant genius in the bud. But we are greatly interested to learn how early the Spirit of God began to move him against the vices and worldliness which overspread the whole of England in his day. Rules of life drawn up by himself, on entering Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1705, evince a depth of religious feeling then most rare among young men, with a keen sense of those dangers which have shipwrecked so many promising careers at the outset. His attachment to the House of Stuart early exposed him to suspicion among favourers of the new dynasty; yet we doubt if the speech at 'the Trypos,' which occasioned such a flutter in Erastian breasts, was really more than a *jeu d'esprit* on his part, impulsively springing from exuberance of spirits and that love of fun which to the last lurked under a grave demeanour. At the crisis which soon after occurred, however, he showed that loyal devotion to hereditary right was not wanting in him. His non-juring principles, indeed, threw a shadow on all the future of his life and consigned his splendid abilities to comparative obscurity. What light it is possible to obtain concerning the curious episode of a 'curacy in London' Mr. Overton provides: and the whole character of William Law flouts the ungenerous insinuation that he either swallowed the Oath of Abjuration or evaded it to play the contemptible part of a 'gay parson upon town.' If any large proportion of pious people had proved equally conscientious and courageous, events might have taken a turn for the House of Hanover upon the result of which it is idle at this date to speculate. Dr. Hoadly was at the height of his notoriety when Law addressed to him publicly three letters, which at once established his reputation as a controversialist of great ability. But they received no answer; no doubt, as Mr. Overton tells us, for the reason implied by Dr. Sherlock. Silence is the safest and most dignified resort for a great man in a hobble: which some modern prelates might advantageously remember, though Hoadly himself did not bethink him of it till he had thrown down the gauntlet so recklessly. The clear summary of Law's arguments presented here is all the more valuable because they are opportunely appropriate to objections in the present day hazarded at second hand by various writers and talkers against the truth. Perhaps Dr. Hoadly was not at heart a disbeliever, and only succumbed to that sad infatuation of superior intellects—the love

of paradox ; but by his own rashness he became identified with heresy of the most malignant type, and shamefully inconsistent with his position as a successor of the Apostles. Equally concise is a summary of Law's publication in reply to Mandeville's 'Fable of the Bees,' which, as well as his examination of the treatises upon *Stage Entertainments* and *Christian Perfection* (that beautiful embryo from which the *Serious Call* emanated afterwards), will well repay the careful attention of his readers. It is quite true that Law himself was the best answer to his craze against 'mere human learning : ' for he had a mind stored with knowledge of various kinds, which tinctured all he wrote. His natural 'asperity of temper' would have repelled even good people more than unfortunately it did if it had not been softened by Divine grace. He was no doubt 'unpracticable,' but under a rugged exterior there beat a heart of tenderest sympathy and purest benevolence, a counterpart to which could scarcely be found among the truest professors in his day ; and the bounty dispensed by him, and by the ladies with whom he lived, might be deplored as injudicious almsgiving ; but there is little fear of its being extensively imitated. Fortunately for us, he had his 'Boswell' in a Dr. Byrom, a judicious use of whose journal by our author here gives us a clear insight into the gradual attraction of Law's mind towards that Mysticism with which it became at last thoroughly imbued. Nevertheless he exhibited much wisdom and discrimination in dealing with persons who consulted him on spiritual questions, and could always put his finger upon the weak points of their characters or arguments. This appears strikingly in his dealings with John Wesley, for whom he did what Wesley never could have done for him, namely, elevate and purify his conceptions on the subject of vital religion. We think Mr. Overton deals too gently and kindly with Wesley for his breach of respect and cordiality with Law, though he acutely observes that the vinegar used by Law under a sense of duty upon this and other occasions was 'uncommonly pungent.' We fully concur in the high estimate formed of the *Serious Call*. There is a just appreciation of its great merits and slight blemishes, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge ought to profit by the kindly hint—too kindly—about its miserable abridgment. Ordinary readers are put in possession of so much as they will want to know of other controversies in which Law was engaged at different times, and of the beautiful simplicity of his life at home, which we shall not spoil the account of by any forestalment. To thoughtful readers still more interesting will be our author's account of Mysticism and of Law's connexion with it from the commencement, under the direction of Jacob Behmen, whose style was, from defective education, as rugged and graceless as that studiously affected by the late Mr. Carlyle. A shoemaker, perpetually revolving the same ideas in his mind, without learning and inquiry, must of necessity be 'a dreamer,' as Warburton termed him ; but it were a blessing for oneself if one always dreamed of heavenly things. It will be evident from this volume that Law never had any tendency towards Romanism, though, like other pious and devout persons, he has been accused of it by ignorant and Puritanical religionists. Nor

did he ever consciously diverge a hair's breadth from the Catholic doctrine and discipline of the English Church, even if his favourite system led him sometimes into dangerous ground. His life, like his writings, was mainly absorbed with the love of God, and if he expressed no admiration for S. Bernard he was heartily at one with him in his conviction concerning it. We cordially commend this book for the whole tone and manner in which it has been produced.

Life and Correspondence of the Right Reverend Samuel Seabury, D.D., First Bishop of Connecticut and of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America. By E. EDWARDS BEARDSLEY, D.D., LL.D., Rector of S. Thomas's Church, New Haven. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Co. London: Trübner and Co. 1881.)

ALL who have read Dr. Beardsley's interesting volumes on the history of the Church in the State of Connecticut must have recognized that he was the fit person to undertake the biography of the first Bishop of the American Church. The State of Connecticut holds a somewhat similar place in the history of the American Church to that which the little kingdom of Kent holds in the history of the Church of England. Connecticut was secularly as insignificant compared to New York as Kent was compared to Wessex, and if the organization of the American Church had taken place in the sixth century instead of the eighteenth, the Bishops of Connecticut would have been the Primates of the United States. Quite apart from his historical significance, Bishop Seabury was a prelate who deserved a fuller biography than he has hitherto received. It is not too much to say that in his clear and conscious grasp of the Catholic and Apostolic ideas of his office he was very far ahead of the majority of his brother prelates in England, from whom he failed to obtain consecration. When we read some of his letters and episcopal utterances it is hard to believe that he lived a century ago. Samuel Seabury was born at Groton, in Connecticut, on November 30, 1729. Curiously enough, it was the very month and year in which Oxford Methodism began, which was to exercise so dominant an influence on the religious history of the United States. In November 1729, John Wesley writes, 'the then Rector of Lincoln College, Dr. Morley, sent for me to Oxford, to take pupils. In this employ I continued till 1735, when I went as a missionary to Georgia.' If the large sums bequeathed by Archbishops Tenison and Secker and Bishop Benson towards the establishment of an American episcopacy had been allowed to be employed for that purpose, it is probable that the Methodists, still, as we believe, numerically the largest of American sects, would not have been lost to the Church. Dr. Whitehead, the early biographer of Wesley, calls the year 1784—the year of Dr. Seabury's consecration—'the grand climacteric year of Methodism, because of the changes which now took place in its original constitution.' It was the year not only of the institution of that really 'valid and regular episcopate' which the clergy of Connecticut, in their most touching letters to the archbishops, as their 'most dutiful sons and obedient humble servants,'

in vain entreated those prelates to bestow on Dr. Seabury, but it was the year in which the octogenarian John Wesley created his Tulchan episcopate, and set apart the ambitious Dr. Coke 'to preside over the flock of Christ' (September 2, 1784). In his letter testimonial to the Methodists of North America, commending Coke and Asbury as their future 'superintendents,' Wesley stated, first, that he had 'desired the Bishop of London to ordain one, but could not prevail'; and secondly, that 'if they (the English bishops) had consented, we know the slowness of their proceedings, but the matter admits of no delay.' Dr. Seabury arrived in England in July 1783, fifteen months before the aged Wesley's creation of his pseudo-episcopate. Dr. Beardsley details at length the wearying delays which the elect of Connecticut patiently and bravely endured. He laboured hard month after month to overcome the objections of the Anglican prelates. The best history of the episode, however, is contained in Dr. Seabury's letters to the anxious clergy in America. Every detail, encouraging or discouraging, was regularly despatched by him to them. The grandeur of the man appears in his thorough freedom from impatience, grounded evidently upon his clear certainty of his Divine call through a competent Catholic authority. He was not without a sympathetic appreciation of the difficulties raised by the English prelates from their own point of view, but he could not acknowledge their force as arguments for withholding 'the deposit' in their gift, while the English archbishops and bishops were utterly unable to appreciate the political or religious situation of the American people, or the deep Church feeling of the Connecticut clergy. Dr. Beardsley is far more impatient than Dr. Seabury was. The independence of the United States

'had not removed,' he says, 'the obstacles hitherto thrown in the way of our American Episcopate. The old policy of preferring political expediency to religious right still paralysed the energies of the Church of England, and diminished the fervency of her zeal and the extent of her charity. The bishops differed somewhat in their views, and while they sympathized with the plan, and hoped for its success, they all saw impediments that hindered them from proceeding.'

It is impossible to calculate what the Church has lost in America by the traditional hesitation of the English bishops to fulfil their office. Wesley's complaints, in his apology for sending over his Tulchan episcopate, are well known. For nearly a century, as the clergy stated in one of the letters, the American Church had exhibited such a sense of the need and supereminent importance of a valid episcopacy, that it had been sending its candidates three thousand miles for holy orders. Immediately after the definitive separation from England there seems to have been a powerful gravitation of the educated members of the sects towards the Church. It was a fixed, conservative, traditional element in the midst of a society where everything was new and unproved. This was especially the case in the State of Connecticut. The Archbishop of Canterbury had, or affected to have, a cautious dread of offending the citizens of the Republic. He may have fancied that the descendants of the

Puritans inverted the axiom of our first Stewart monarch, and imagined that a bishop must ultimately involve a king. Some of the prelates were in a confused state of mind as to the range and limit of ecclesiastical *mission*. 'They are apprehensive that my consecration,' wrote Dr. Seabury from London, September 3, 1783, 'would be looked upon in the light of *sending* a bishop to Connecticut, and that the State of Connecticut would resist, and that they should be censured as meddlers.' It is worthy of notice that Dr. Seabury had from the first wished that the consent of the State of Connecticut should be applied for, in the spirit of the ancient canons that a bishop should be a *persona grata* to the State. 'Nobody here,' he wrote again from London, 'will risk anything for the sake of the Church, or for the sake of continuing episcopal ordination in America. Unless, therefore, it be made a ministerial affair, none of the bishops will proceed in it, for fear of clamour.' A year later, still in London, and still persistently interviewing the prelates, he informed the Connecticut clergy that he had determined to turn from the heads of the English Church to the English State. On April 30, 1784, he showed his latest letter from the clergy of Connecticut to the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of London and Oxford. The last 'thought it was worthy of serious consideration.' The Bishop of London 'thought nothing was wanting but an Act of Parliament to dispense with the State oaths.' The Archbishop of York 'gave no opinion, but wished that I would lose no time in showing it to the Archbishop of Canterbury.' During the month of May 1784 he saw the Archbishop of Canterbury again and again. 'His Grace's behaviour, though polite, I thought was cool and restrained.' The Archbishop complained that it was only the application of the clergy, not of the Legislature. The Bishop of London was 'an amiable man, but very infirm, and I think his memory and faculties are declining. He avoids business as much as possible.' Wesley had just made the same discovery. Meanwhile some congregations in the southern States of America had sent over some young men with a petition to the Archbishop to ordain them. From the dilatory way in which the prelate dealt with the business they had actually applied to the Danish bishops through the Danish ambassador at the Hague. This startled the Archbishop, and he told Dr. Seabury that he was willing and ready to give them holy orders 'when it could be consistently done. These young gentlemen,' as the more patient and persistent Seabury adds, 'had met with every encouragement to tempt them to a voyage to Denmark.' He told his brethren that he had 'determined, if the bishops hang back, to bring the matter before Parliament by petition; and if that fail the scheme will be at an end here, I fear for ever.'

On August 31, however, he applied through Dr. Myles Cooper to the bishops of Scotland. Dr. Cooper, like Seabury himself, had been a devoted Loyalist, and a consequent sufferer in America. He had lost everything, fled to England, and obtained an English benefice. The way for the Scottish consecration of the first American bishop had been already paved for Dr. Seabury, without his knowledge of it, by the zealous interest of Dr. George Berkeley,

son of the great bishop, in the American Church. He wrote to Bishop John Skinner, of Aberdeen, as early as 1782, urging that the 'persecuted Church of Scotland' was peculiarly called to convey the episcopacy 'to the struggling, persecuted Protestant episcopalian worshippers in America,' and to send bishops 'before general assemblies can be held and covenants taken for their perpetual exclusion.' Bishop Skinner saw that nothing could be done by him and his brethren, who were themselves politically suspected as Nonjurors, while the American States were still regarded as in rebellion against King George. The correspondence between Dr. Berkeley and Bishop Skinner continued in 1783. In the next year the former heard, to his joy, that an American priest had arrived in London, 'seeking what, it seems, in the present state of affairs, he cannot expect to receive in our Church. Surely,' he wrote to Bishop Skinner, 'the Scotch prelates, who are not shackled by any Erastian connection, will not send this suppliant empty away.'

We need not tell the story of Dr. Seabury's consecration in Scotland. It is excellently told by Dr. Beardsley. Two more efforts were made in June and July 1784 to obtain the gift from England, and in August Dr. Seabury applied to Scotland. He had been a passionate Loyalist and had suffered for his devotion to the King, but his experiences in England seem to have completely Americanized him and republicanized him. Before leaving for Scotland he spoke very plainly to each of the English Archbishops. He told the Archbishop of Canterbury that as there was no law in England relative to a bishop who was to reside in a foreign State, he was 'left to the general laws of the Christian Church, and had no need either of the King's leave or dispensation. But the opinion of so little a man,' he modestly adds, 'cannot have much weight.' The Archbishop still talked of nothing but Acts of Parliament, the Attorney-General, and the Solicitor-General. The Archbishop of York, upon whom he called on his journey into Scotland, exclaimed, 'Dr. Seabury, do you not know that these Scottish bishops are Jacobites?' 'Yes,' he quickly replied, 'and, if report say true, your Grace's Nonjuring principles are the brightest jewels in your Grace's mitre.' The Archbishop smiled and said no more on the subject. No one watched the eager efforts of the American Church to obtain a free and valid episcopate with more anxiety than the noble Charles Wesley. He hoped that it would save American Methodism from developing into schism. But his brother kept him in the dark while the Tulchan Wesleyan episcopate was being hurriedly manufactured at Bristol, although Charles was in that city on the day of Dr. Coke's 'ordination for America.' In his own words, it 'dissolved the partnership, though not the friendship,' between him and his brother. 'Had they had patience a little longer they would have seen a real bishop in America.' He saw Bishop Seabury,

'who told me,' he adds, 'that he looked upon the Methodists in America as sound members of the Church, and was ready to ordain any of their preachers whom he should find duly qualified. His ordination would

indeed be genuine, valid, and episcopal. But what are your poor Methodists now? Only a new sect of Presbyterians.'

We have dwelt at some length upon the one episode in Bishop Seabury's career which is likely to be of most interest to English Churchmen. We regret that it has only left us the space to speak in general terms of the remainder of the eventful life of this great father of the American Church, the model of a primitive bishop, the humble believer, the sturdy and masculine Christian, the Catholic theologian, the wise and far-sighted administrator. A strong common sense and a fatherly tenderness were mingled in his character. He had need of both in his difficult task of securing the permanent unification of priests and congregations to whom the presence and powers of an actual living bishop came as a strange novelty. When the Dissenting preachers began to use the title of 'Bishop,' partly as a sign of their equality with him and partly in derision of his claims, Dr. Seabury adopted the mitre, wearing it on all important occasions, 'as a badge of office which they would hardly be disposed to imitate.' His *Communion Office, or Order for the Administration of the Holy Eucharist*, set forth in 1786 for the diocese of Connecticut, and always warmly defended by him, followed the Scottish Office. Traces of the attachment of the people to it still lingered when Dr. Beardsley was ordained deacon in 1835. The clergy ordained by Bishop Seabury still read the prayer of humble access after the consecration. In his charge to his clergy in 1786 he said that the celebration of the Eucharist must not be regarded

'as an arbitrary command of God to show His sovereign authority over us, nor as a bare remembrance of Christ's death.' It is 'the Christian sacrifice, commemorative of the great sacrifice of atonement which Christ had made for the sins of the whole world, wherein, under the symbol of the bread and the cup, the Body and Blood of Christ, which He offered up, and which were broken and shed upon the Cross, are figured forth, and being presented to God, our heavenly Father, by His priest here on earth, the merits of Christ for the remission of sins are pleaded by him, and we trust by our great High Priest Himself in heaven; and being sanctified by prayer, thanksgiving, the words of institution, and the invocation of the Holy Ghost, are divided among the communicants as a feast upon the sacrifice.'

How many of the contemporary English prelates, who had refused to undergo the risk of consecrating Dr. Seabury, would have spoken with similar grasp, precision, and freedom from hesitation? In 1789, after Dr. White's consecration as Bishop of Pennsylvania, Bishop Seabury addressed a long letter to him on the importance of maintaining 'the analogy of faith as handed down to us by the Holy Catholic Church,' and protesting against the exclusion of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds and the leaving out the 'descent into hell' from the Apostles' Creed. 'Have we a right?' he asked. 'If the doctrine of those creeds be offensive, we are sorry for it, and shall hold ourselves so much the more bound to retain them.' He blamed the Church of England for 'the concessions she has made in giving up several primitive, and I suppose apostolical, usages, to gratify

the humours of fault-finding men.' 'Let us remember,' he wrote to Bishop White, 'that it is the particular business of the bishops of Christ's Church to preserve it pure and undefiled, in faith and practice, according to the model left by apostolic practice. And may God give you grace and courage to act accordingly.' Bishop Seabury further told his brother prelate that he regarded the Communion Office as 'the most exceptionable part of the English book. The grand fault in that office is the deficiency of a more formal oblation of the elements, and of the invocation of the Holy Ghost to sanctify and bless them.' Bishop Seabury observed that the consecration is made by the English book to consist merely in the priest's laying his hands on the elements, and pronouncing 'This is My Body,' &c. These words, he said, 'are not consecration at all, nor were they addressed by Christ to the Father, but were declarative to the Apostles. This is so exactly symbolizing with the Church of Rome in an error—an error, too, on which the absurdity of Transubstantiation is built—that nothing but having fallen into the same error themselves would have prevented the (Roman) enemies of the Church from casting it in their teeth. The efficacy of baptism, of confirmation, of orders, is ascribed to the Holy Ghost, and His energy is implored for that purpose; and why He should not be invoked for that purpose, especially as all the old liturgies are full to the point, I cannot conceive.' 'It is much easier to account for the alterations of the first Liturgy of Edward VI., than to justify them.' Bishop Seabury cites a vote on the minutes of Bishop White's Convention, three years previously, for the revision of this point.

'I hope it will be taken up,' he adds, 'and that God will raise up some able and worthy advocate for this primitive practice, and make you and the Convention the instruments of restoring it to His Church in America. It would do you more honour in the world, and contribute more to the union of the Churches, than any other alterations you can make, and would restore the Holy Eucharist to its ancient dignity and efficacy.'

Such an extract will show that Bishop Seabury was a prelate ahead of his time, and was as modern as he was primitive. He died on February 25, 1796. His income was scanty to the last, and much of it was derived from friends in England. 'The poor will miss him,' as a public journal said at the time, 'both as a physician and a friend.' Dr. Beardsley has given as a frontispiece a copy of Duché's portrait of the Bishop. The book is one which Churchmen should make a point of reading.

Dr. Appleton: his Life and Literary Relics. By JOHN H. APPLETON, M.A., late Vicar of S. Mark's, Staplefield, Sussex, and A. H. SAYCE, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College and Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford. (London: Trübner and Co. 1881.)

THE world will certainly not be the worse for Mr. Appleton's interesting and graceful memoir of his brother, the late Dr. Appleton, whose short but well-filled life terminated February 1, 1880, in his thirty-ninth year. After a careful training at the home which was

also his school, his father being Head Master of Reading School, and a diligent course of study at Oxford, directed rather too widely, perhaps, for the attainment of the highest University honours, Charles Appleton attended lectures at Heidelberg, and afterwards, as a matriculated student, at Berlin.

Returning to Oxford in 1867, a firm adherent of the Hegelian system of thought, he became Lecturer in Philosophy at S. John's College, of which he was already Fellow. His wide reading and diligent habits were now bearing fruit not only in college lectures which, according to the testimony of those who heard them, were remarkable for subtlety, clearness, and power of expression, but also in contributions to literature, including fourteen articles in Blunt's *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*.

It is, however, as the founder, in 1869, and editor until his death, of the *Academy*, for the sake of which he removed his residence to London, and which he laboured enthusiastically to establish, in order to promote the diffusion of culture, and, secondly, as the organizer of a public movement in favour of the endowment of research, that Dr. Appleton's name is best known. We express no opinion as to the feasibility of widely endowing research from public funds, but the question was at least worth raising, and it was characteristic of Dr. Appleton's generous ardour for the promotion of knowledge that he devoted so much energy to the movement.

These various labours, pursued with intense eagerness, seem to have prematurely exhausted a constitution not over strong. To the regret of a wide circle of friends, to whom his earnest but genial and unselfish nature and bright intellect had endeared him, Dr. Appleton was carried off, rather suddenly at the last, in Egypt, whither he had gone by medical advice. The extracts from his diaries and letters, while they give deeper insight into a singularly lovable character, show that his friendship had been valued with good reason, and that they were not mistaken who, to quote Dr. Liddon's words, could 'recognize in him an essentially reverent mind, which has grasped clearly and strongly the indissoluble connexion which exists between faith in God and a living hold on moral truth' (p. 104).

'A career of rare promise cut short:' this, the general sentiment expressed in the many sympathizing letters to his brother on the occasion of Dr. Appleton's death, is also our own. It permits, or almost implies, the opinion, which will be held by widely differing thinkers, that, apart from the products of his intellectual industry, which are valuable, the products of his thought lack the marks of maturity. To some it will seem that the substance of his religious belief would probably have been surrendered had he lived to think out the results of his principles. We, however, cannot but think that the disintegrating phase of thought, consciously experienced by him in his undergraduate days, was passing, or had passed entirely, away, and that reconstruction was going on to the last. One of the last reminiscences of an intimate friend, the sum of an 'eager talk late into the night,' is that 'he saw for himself, and hoped to aid others to see, the compatibility of a fearless philosophy with genuine Chris-

tianity;' and his brother tells us that 'the natural bent of Dr. Appleton's mind was eminently synthetic.'

Of the Literary Relics, an appreciative introduction to which is contributed by Professor Sayce to the volume, detailed criticism is here impossible. We select for remark a single point, Dr. Appleton's view in regard to which—in our judgment a mistaken one—appears to have largely influenced the current of his thoughts. 'It is impossible in the long run,' he says, 'for the religious emotions to remain attached to the imagination of events which have been called in question, even though their historical truth may be ultimately established.' We should say, on the contrary, that if in the fierce light of modern criticism the historical truth of the events in question is established, their supremacy over the religious emotions will be more firmly rooted than before. Were it otherwise, it would be sufficient to set up a fraudulent claim to an estate to discredit the title of the lawful owners. At the same time we recognize the importance of showing the compatibility of Christianity with the truths independently arrived at by philosophy.

The Evidential Value of the Acts of the Apostles. The Bohlen Lectures for 1880. By J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester. (London: Isbister and Co., 1881.)

MOST people have heard the keen epigram of an eminent Cambridge Head, when asked what he thought of a sermon preached before the University by Dean Howson. He replied, 'All through the sermon I could not help thinking what a superior man Mr. Conybeare must have been.' This allusive distribution of their several shares in the well-known work on S. Paul is fully borne out by the quality of all such work as Dean Howson has—to use public school slang—'made off his own bat,' especially when he has been incautious enough to attempt new excursions into the old fields. His four discourses on *The Evidential Value of the Acts of the Apostles* delivered in Philadelphia as the Bohlen Lectures—a recent American imitation of the Bampton trust—for 1880, illustrate this remark forcibly enough. Their literary workmanship is fairly neat. There are several true and useful things said in their course, but the homilist obscures the apologist; and while, as parochial sermons, these addresses are distinctly above the average rural level, they are altogether inadequate to grapple with their difficult subject, of whose difficulty the Dean seems scarcely so aware as might antecedently have been expected, for there is scarcely an allusion to it discoverable. Much the best part of the book is that where he is simply content to follow Paley, and to apply the method of the *Horæ Pauline* to comparing various passages of the Acts with one another, instead of with the Epistles. And the most successful instances are his treatment of the narratives of the conversions of S. Paul and of Cornelius. There are, besides, some convenient notices of recent confirmatory discoveries, casting light on historical and topographical references in the Acts; but we fail to see any elements of permanence or vitality in the Dean's slight and hasty treatment of the

problems at issue. It is at least certain that Dr. Howson would never have ventured upon so cursory and merely popular handling of his topic had he been preaching the Bampton or the Hulsean lecture before the University of Oxford or Cambridge; and we entirely fail to see why he should have thought himself justified in holding that he was at liberty to deal more perfunctorily with the younger foundation. If he was not prepared for much more thorough work, it would have been more respectful to his kind hosts to have excused himself from the task; but, to be sure, they ought to have known better than to ask him to undertake it.

Individualism, its Growth and Tendencies; with some Suggestions as to the Remedy for its Evils: Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in November 1880. By the Right Reverend A. N. LITTLEJOHN, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Long Island. (Cambridge: Deighton and Bell, 1881.)

BISHOP LITTLEJOHN of Long Island has printed the three sermons he delivered before the University of Cambridge in November 1880 on *Individualism, its Growth and Tendencies*, and it is doing him only justice to say that he took more pains to acquit himself sufficiently in England than Dean Howson did in America; for these sermons, though not probing the very depths of the questions they deal with, at any rate do rise to the rank of academical Conferences, and are not mere parochial homilies. The Bishop takes at the outset the bold line of saying that Individualism, as a moral and social doctrine, is the creation of Christianity, though it is only in this century that it has begun to be accepted widely in politics and philosophy, and thus has still to run its course of exaggeration and extravagance before it is finally co-ordinated with the idea of Society. This near future is before us, and we have got to reckon with it, and the vital question of the day is how to do so, especially as the bad side of the tendency is that which even now is more manifest than the good, in that the immediate bias is towards the disintegration of existing institutions, however salutary and even necessary to human welfare. And what is said of the degradation of art in the hands of that school whereof Mr. Burne Jones is the fashionable hierophant is bitterly true, while the general level of technical execution has risen considerably amongst the ruck of artists; nor has the Bishop forgotten to point out that the same holds good in literature. We have a great deal more of it respectably done, but the giants are as rare as ever, perhaps rarer. The second lecture, on the function of Christianity in dealing with the spirit itself has roused, and the third, on the relation of the family and the State to the like inquiry, are less vigorous than the first, as is but natural, because they are only tentative answers to the problem set in the first discourse. They leave a sense of incompleteness behind them, but they are suggestive enough to merit pondering, as they are the expression of an acute mind, which knows what modern unbelief really is and means; unlike Archbishop Tait in his late Charge, which never got beyond Chubb and Toland.

Parochial Papers. By the LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD. No. 1—*Plain Instruction on Holy Communion.* (London: W. Skeffington and Sons, 1881.)

THE Bishop of Lichfield is issuing a series of *Parochial Papers*, of which the first, *Plain Instruction on Holy Communion*, is a reprint of a tract he put forth in 1871. It illustrates very well Dr. Maclagan's own position and temper, as being much more of a diligent pastor than of a learned theologian, and as discharging the office of a useful link between the highest level of the Evangelical section and the lower strata of High Anglicans. In the tract before us, for example, the main idea which the ancient liturgies and those divines who follow their teaching describe as the 'Eucharistic Sacrifice' is present, though expressed in the least aggressive language, by no means so direct and emphatic as that which not merely the Wesleys, but Watts and Doddridge themselves, employed when they allowed themselves to use the phrases of Christian devotion rather than of Nonconformist polemics; and the like is true of the statements on the Real Presence. There is one place, however, where the Bishop involves himself in a contradiction, out of which his primary Charge shows that he has not yet disentangled his ideas. It is in what he says on Confession and Absolution. He sees and says plainly enough that to make *confession* a rare and exceptional thing is to destroy its practical utility, and to do much what restricting a physician's services to the blue stage of cholera would effect; but he does say that *absolution* ought to be quite exceptional and sought only in the last resort. This is not only to limit unwarrantably the 'whosoever' of S. John xx. 23, and to conflict with the two daily absolutions of the Prayer Book, but it is to run into the very Roman danger he obviously wishes to avoid. For the practical evil in the Roman Church has been incomparably less the multiplication of absolutions, with the result of making people ready to run up a new score when the old one has been easily wiped out, than the abdication of personal responsibility, by always running to a priest for advice instead of using the faculty of conscience. Absolution in formal confession is not so likely to produce this result, and it is *over-direction* which needs guarding against. But Bishop Maclagan does not guard against that at all.

The Lord's Body. (London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1881.)

THIS is an anonymous treatise on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, by a pious person so unversed in theology as to suppose that the Catholic doctrine is that what is imparted in the Eucharist by the act of communion is 'physical and material,' consisting of 'the elements of Christ's physical Body,' and who, unable to accept such a tenet, sets himself to provide a substitute for it. That substitute is the old high Zwinglian doctrine, something like what Horneck taught, that what is given in the Holy Eucharist is not Christ's Body and Blood, but Christ's Spirit, which so unites with our spirits that we become one body with Him, so that He is to our spirits what the heart and the vital organs and the blood of the human body are to its several

VOL. XII.—NO. XXIII. Y

members and limbs. This is a devout opinion which might have been true, but it is most certainly not the statement of Christ Himself, nor S. Paul's gloss thereon, nor the view formulated in the most ancient liturgies, nor yet that which prevailed everywhere in Christendom down to the time of Berenger of Tours. The book has an interest and value of its own, as showing how much earnest Christian thought and devotion is compatible with entire misconception of important theological doctrine; and thus its perusal by those who are better grounded in divinity than the writer may promote tolerant and charitable feelings in their minds; but as an exposition of orthodox belief it has no claims to attention. And the writer seems to have no conception that every argument he adduces against the Catholic doctrine is equally valid to confute the objective reality of the Ascension.

Diocesan Histories.—Canterbury. By ROBERT C. JENKINS, M.A., Rector and Vicar of Lyminge, Hon. Canon of Canterbury.
Salisbury. By WILLIAM HENRY JONES, M.A., F.S.A., Vicar of Bradford-on-Avon. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1880.)

THESE two volumes are the first instalments of a series, which, when completed, will form a valuable addition to the history of the Church in this country. When the annals of every diocese shall have been written, we may hope to obtain an accurate picture of the English Church in all the stages of its growth. It will be highly instructive to note the points of similarity and of difference in the life of the several dioceses. For each diocese has its own tale to tell; nay more, each monastic house and each parish, if we could but recover their annals; for every fresh discovery which we make only helps us to estimate the immense stores which have either hopelessly perished or yet remain to be revealed. Pre-eminent in value among these lost treasures are the registers of the see of Canterbury prior to the year 1279. Mr. Jenkins records and laments their removal to Rome (p. 156), and all students will warmly sympathize with him in the hope that they may even yet be some day extricated from the huge piles of documents which repose in the vaults beneath the Vatican.

The publication of these Diocesan Histories ought to be especially welcome to loyal Churchmen at the present time; for they may help to expel from the popular mind some very old and mischievous errors, which are by no means extinct, and which enemies of the Church in the present day diligently strive to preserve and propagate. No one, for instance, who takes the trouble to read these two volumes will be able to imagine that the State *at any given time, by any one definite act, established the Church* in preference to some other forms of religion. He will learn, if he did not know it before, that when Christianity was first brought to these shores, and long afterwards, England was not one kingdom, but many kingdoms; and that there was not one National Church, but many Churches. For instance, the Church was planted in Kent by S. Augustine in 597 A.D.; it was planted in Wessex about forty years later; but the

Church in Wessex was in no sense an offshoot from the Church in Kent, and Birinus, the Apostle of Wessex, had no connexion with S. Augustine, the Apostle of Kent. The only way in which the Church was established was by the king and his people in this kingdom or in that accepting Christianity in the form in which it was introduced to them. Church and State were coextensive in the several kingdoms; they were but two sides of the same thing; they grew together, and so as England gradually became one kingdom the Church gradually became one National Church. As the history of one diocese after another comes to be published the truth of this will become increasingly apparent.

Turning to the two histories now before us, we find the metropolitan diocese was conterminous with the kingdom of Kent; and since that kingdom did not grow and swallow up other kingdoms, the diocese never became a large one and never had to be subdivided.¹ In Wessex the case was precisely the reverse. The West Saxon kings were continually pushing their conquests in all directions, especially westwards, and as the kingdom advanced the Church moved with it. Fresh dioceses were carved out to provide for the spiritual needs of the newly acquired territory, and the diocese of Sarum is only the final arrangement arrived at in 1075, after four hundred years of shifting sees and expanding and contracting diocesan boundaries. To trace this development was the first part of Mr. Jones's task, and by no means the easiest: but he has threaded his way through the intricacies of it with the skill which might be expected from him by those who are acquainted with his former labours in the field of archæology and ecclesiastical history.

No such complicated processes of change had to be unravelled in tracing the early history of the diocese of Canterbury. It is therefore the more to be regretted that Mr. Jenkins, in the beginning of his volume, should have wasted a good deal of space upon matters hardly relevant to his subject. His business was to write a concise history of the diocese of Canterbury. Consequently it is rather provoking to find the first chapter entitled 'The Roman Period,' and consisting of eighteen pages of conjectures respecting the sort of Christianity which may have existed in Kent before the coming of Augustine, that is to say, before there was any diocese of Canterbury at all. The arrival of S. Augustine, on the other hand, and the actual foundation of the see, are passed over by Mr. Jenkins in a few lines, because he thinks (p. 25) that the story 'has been too often and too well told to need any repetition.' But surely in a historical manual, intended for popular use, the story, old as it is, should have been told again and made the most of. The proper proportion of things is lost if we have pages of learned discussion upon subsidiary matters while the events of central importance are dismissed with a brief notice. This fault runs more or less through the whole of Mr. Jenkins's volume. He is a learned man, but he has not acquired the art of self-control in the production of his learning. It is quite

¹ The diocese of Rochester was probably coextensive with the sub-kingdom of the West Kentings.

true that a really trustworthy and useful popular history cannot be written by any but a really learned student who is master of his subject ; but his learning should be managed with artistic skill ; not thrust prominently forward in the shape of dissertations, but wrought into the texture of an attractive narrative. Mr. Jenkins's volume might be vastly improved by a careful revision and recasting of the contents, with a free use of the pruning knife ; by the introduction of fresh paragraphs where there is a transition to a new subject, a point in which the book is at present very defective ; also by the addition of a table of contents for each chapter, or an enlarged index.

After making all deductions, however, for these defects, it must be allowed that the history of the diocese of Canterbury is replete with interest and instruction. Mr. Jenkins is, with occasional slips, accurate in his statements, and, like Mr. Jones, has spared no pains in going to original sources of information. The origin of the endowments of the Church, for instance, in the gifts of private individuals (a very important point to insist on in these days), and the spirit of simple child-like faith in which they were made, are well illustrated in Mr. Jenkins's book by quotations from the preambles to the charters of the donors (pp. 53 and 54). We have an interesting account of the foundation of the monasteries of Dover, Folkestone, and Lymping (p. 39). Mr. Jenkins is fuller in his notices of monastic houses than Mr. Jones, though we think both authors might have made rather more of this part of their subject, and perhaps also of the architectural department. The latter must, however, have been an extremely difficult topic to handle within the limits assigned to our authors, and their remarks, as far as they go, especially those of Mr. Jenkins, are very instructive. Mr. Jones has of course not failed to notice the extraordinary interest of his own little Romanesque church at Bradford-on-Avon, and has done justice to the architectural genius of Bishop Roger in the twelfth century.

Besides the vices which beset the mediæval Church as a whole, each of the two dioceses now under consideration suffered from a drawback peculiar to itself. The primates were so much occupied with their duties, partly as metropolitans, partly as high officers of State, that the diocese of Canterbury, small though it was, became much neglected. Sarum, on the other hand, was so large that even with the aid of suffragan bishops, sometimes as many as four or five, episcopal supervision seems to have been very inadequately conducted.

The most salient characteristics of Church life between the Norman Conquest and the Reformation, the evils of pluralities and non-residence, the struggles for emancipation from episcopal control on the part of cathedral and monastic chapters, the ignorance of the parochial clergy and the rise of the orders of mendicant preachers, the Lollard movement, the increasing wealth and secularity of the Church, side by side with a more ornate style of architecture and ceremonial ; all these are copiously illustrated by our authors from original sources.

The very gradual approach and progress of the Reformation is

carefully brought out in both histories : a matter of great importance as helping to dispose of another vulgar error, that one Church was removed at a given time and another put in its place. Among the most interesting extracts from original records of the sixteenth century are the account of Archbishop Warham's visitation, Cardinal Pole's inquiry, the burning of a heretic at Canterbury, and a sale of church furniture in 1547 (*Canterbury*, pp. 238, 249, 260, 263).

A curious example of the continuity of the Church through the critical changes of the sixteenth century is afforded in the career of Bishop Salcot or Capon, who having been appointed to the see of Sarum in the reign of Henry VIII. held it through the reigns of Edward VI. and Mary and part of the reign of Elizabeth (*Salisbury*, p. 160).

It is abundantly clear from these two volumes that the most potent source of danger to the Church during the reign of Elizabeth was the influence of the Puritan party, and that with respect to ritual the aim of the Queen and Parker, by the publication of the Advertisements (whether they received the royal authority or not), and in all other ways, was not to restrain excesses, but to remedy disorder and defect. There is a very interesting extract given by Mr. Jones (p. 194) from the record of Laud's visitation in 1634, which proves that a struggle between a Puritan and a Church party was carried on at that time in almost every parish in Wiltshire. Of the two dioceses Canterbury seems to have been the greater sufferer from Puritan and Calvinistic influence.

From the time of the Commonwealth to the close of the last century our authors have to relate much which it is melancholy and painful to read. As the annals of each diocese come to be written, strange tales no doubt will be brought to light of the extraordinary trials under which the Church laboured, first from internal dissensions, secondly from apathy and worldliness, in that which has been well called 'the glacial period' of her history, when her rulers seem to have dreaded nothing so much as 'enthusiasm.' Mr. Jenkins gives an interesting sketch of the rise and progress of Wesleyanism in Kent, and both our authors do justice to the great and good men inside the Church to whom her preservation under God during this dark time was due. On the whole the retrospect which these volumes help us to take of the past history of our Church may well make us content with the times in which our lot is cast. Without underrating the many and grave difficulties which beset us, we may say 'passi graviora,' thank God, and take courage.

Theology and Science: an Address delivered to Students preparing for Ordination at the Clergy School at Leeds in December 1880. By Sir JAMES PAGET, Bart., F.R.S. (London : Rivingtons, 1881.)

WE heartily commend this admirable address to our readers. A man of Sir James Paget's high scientific reputation, who is equally well known as a devout and intelligent Churchman, will be listened to with the respect he deserves from both sides when he discusses 'the position of antagonism in which theology and science seem to stand.'

The italics are ours. The author's first point is that such opposition exists only between what he calls 'intellectual and inferential theology' and 'the most distant inferences of science.' All such conclusions are, he thinks, 'inferences from imperfect knowledge.' No doubt this is a most useful caution to both sides. There is great practical wisdom in Sir James Paget's remark that serious disputes and differences of opinion must of necessity arise between theologians and scientists, as in every other branch of human thought, without its being necessary to 'assume or believe in any necessary opposition between the truths of science and religion.' The following passage will show the conclusion drawn from such premises as these:—

'Now, I would use these considerations as part of the reasons for inducing you to remember always that when two beliefs seem incompatible, it does not follow that one is true and the other false; they may both be true. In the disputes of theologians and men of science it is generally believed that one side must be in the wrong; yet, in many of them, both may be right, and their opposition may be due to their both being ignorant of some intermediate truth which, when gained by increasing knowledge, will combine the truths they now hold apart'—(p. 13).

Sir James believes that truths which seem inconsistent with each other in the present state of knowledge will be found to be capable of reconciliation when seen in a higher light. He counsels a tolerant reception of seemingly opposed truths in a spirit of humble moderation. With keen irony he exposes the folly of those who think it much easier to ascertain the truth in another man's business than in their own. He is quite right. Some divines believe in quack-doctors; some natural philosophers have, like Faraday, adopted the most narrow forms of religious sectarianism. 'As I have often known,' says Sir James, 'the same man will accept as a fact in medical science, as a fact by which he may guide his conduct, any careless statement made by a silly woman; or he will adopt, as a theological principle, the opinion of a poorly educated preacher or his less educated self.' The whole address is thoroughly worth reading and weighing. Those who believe with us that theology is the *scientia scientiarum* will wish that the title of Sir James Paget's paper had been 'Theology and *Natural Science*.'

1. *Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects*. By H. HELMHOLTZ, Professor of Physics in the University of Berlin. Translated by E. Atkinson, Ph.D., &c. First Series. With an Introduction by Professor Tyndall. Second Edition. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1881.)
2. *Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects*. By the same Author and Translator. Second Series. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1881.)

THE reader of scientific tastes who has not yet made the acquaintance of Professor Helmholtz's *Popular Lectures* has a pleasure in store. Many of them have now been before the world for so many years, and the Professor has exercised such a commanding influence upon

other teachers of science, that the ideas enunciated in them have for the most part found their way into many publications. But, for completeness of detail and for examples of consummate mastery of the art of exposition, the Professor's own pages must be resorted to. It is only by seeing for oneself how majestic is the grasp of his thought, how able and orderly his marshalling of facts, how forcible the arguments with which he supports his views, that one can understand his influence in the scientific world of to-day. We have amongst ourselves men of science who deservedly rank high as expounders of scientific truth to the uninitiated, but many of them will most readily acknowledge that they have not only derived views of truth and even illustrations from Professor Helmholtz, but also some instruction in the art of exposition.

We could mention several occasions in recent years when Professor Helmholtz has been quoted as an authority for some scientific statement. We must, however, remark that he is sometimes quoted in a rather one-sided manner. Thus his description of the defects in the human eye¹ has been referred to, and his words quoted:—'Now, it is not too much to say that if an optician wanted to sell me an instrument which had all these defects, I should think myself quite justified in blaming his carelessness in the strongest terms, and giving him back his instrument.' Whether the words are judicious or not we shall not pronounce: but, taken by themselves, they convey a very different impression from that which they convey when we go on to read that the scientist is only maintaining 'the narrow but indisputable position of a critic on purely optical grounds,'² and when subsequently we find him saying that he has not spent so much time in explaining the imperfection of the eye 'in order to depreciate the performances of this wonderful organ or to diminish our admiration of its construction,' but to prepare the way for showing that 'its extraordinary value depends upon the way in which we use it: its perfection is practical.'³

One of the theories which the Professor expounds, and which is now almost a commonplace of physics, is that of the future though very distant exhaustion of the active force of the visible universe, or rather its conversion into uniformly diffused heat; a result which will be tantamount to the cessation of all known forms of life and even of all, save molecular, motion.⁴ The visible universe is all but proved scientifically not to be a *perpetuum mobile* as regards the future.

¹ See the lectures on the 'Recent Progress of the Theory of Vision,' *Popular Lectures*, first series, p. 175 seq.

² *Ibid.* p. 194.

³ *Ibid.* p. 200.

⁴ The human race is probably doomed to extinction, in Professor Helmholtz's opinion, long before the death of the universe. 'The same forces,' he says, 'of air and water, and of the volcanic interior, which produced former geological revolutions, and buried one series of living forms after another, act still upon the earth's crust. They more probably will bring about the last day of the human race than those distant cosmical alterations of which we have spoken.'—*Popular Lectures*, first series, p. 171. These ideas are, however, hardly in accord with those most widely entertained by geologists at the present day.

We cannot but remember that believers in the Christian revelation have always asserted something like the same thing. Moreover, it must be equally certain that the same universe cannot, *a parte ante*, have been a *perpetuum mobile*. Professor Helmholtz avoids this point, which, however, has met with due recognition from some honoured English scientists. It is obvious that so long as we keep within the limits of physical science the Kantian criticism of the famous cosmological argument does not apply. Within those limits the argument is irrefutable.

In the second series is contained Professor Helmholtz's paper on the 'Origin and Significance of Geometrical Axioms,' which was first presented to the English public in *Mind*. Many of its ideas were adopted and made the basis of startling conclusions as to the nature of space by the late Professor Clifford. The perusal of Professor Helmholtz's essay may be recommended as an excellent mental gymnastic, whatever may be thought of his doctrine that the axioms of geometry viewed in connexion with the realities of experience have a purely empirical origin. One point he certainly seems to substantiate, namely, that the fundamental axioms of Euclidean geometry require to be supplemented by the notion of rigidity: that is, the assumption of 'the possibility of figures moving without change of form or size.'¹ This notion, it should be added, is the only one which he will allow primarily to be 'conceived as transcendental in Kant's sense, namely, as formed independently of actual experience.'²

It is, perhaps, in relation to physiology that Professor Helmholtz's great powers are seen to the best advantage, and his lectures in the second series 'On the Relation of Optics to Painting,' as well as those in the first series, 'On the Physiological Causes of Harmony in Music' and on the 'Recent Progress of the Theory of Vision,' are very instructive.

The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church. By F. E. WARREN, B.D., Fellow of S. John's College, Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1881.)

THIS very important contribution to our liturgical knowledge in a comparatively unexplored field of study deserves a hearty welcome, and will repay a most careful examination. Part of Mr. Warren's matter has already appeared in our own pages.

The American Church Review. (New York: Pott. London: Trübner, January 1881.)

WE call attention to the fact that this *Review* begins a new series with the current year, and appears now in the form of a quarterly. The first number, now before us, is full of promise, though the Old Catholic movement occupies a rather too large portion of the space. There is an important paper on the 'Introduction of Divorce in Italy,' contributed by Professor Gabba, of Pisa. All the articles are signed. There are short notices, at the end, of new books and of new music.

¹ *Popular Lectures*, second series, p. 64.

² *Ibid.* p. 65.